

Intikhaabi Taarikhi Kashmiri

The English translation of the text of
the Persian translation of
Sanskrit Histories (Raajataranginiis)
ordered by Mughal Emperor Akbar
Also Known as Munich Manuscript

R L Bhat

Intikhaabi Taarikhi kashmiri

The English translation of the text of
the Persian translation of
Sanskrit Histories (Raajataranginiis)
ordered by Mughal Emperor Akbar
Also Known as Munich Manuscript

After Kalhana Pandita, his history of Kashmir, Raajataranginii was continued till 1539 CE through four additions by Joonaraaja, Shrivara, Prajya Bhatta and Shuka. These are the Rajataranginii series of historical record of Kashmir. They provide a continuous, eyewitness account of the Kashmir history from 11th to 16th centuries CE.

This Sanskrit record was got translated into Persian by Akbar after his conquest of Kashmir. The Persian text is available with the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich. Another copy of is in Biblotheque Notianale, Paris. The work is generally known in the history circles of Kashmir as Munich Manuscript and quoted as such. The work is entered as Tārīkh-i Kaśmīr in the Munich library, which however is not correct as the original title, Intikhaabi Taariikhi Kashmiir, is given in the first page of the Persian text. It has held an enormous influence on the narrative of Kashmir history, as all the Persian chronicles except taariikhi sayyid Alii, have been written using this Persian translation as the source material.

Titled Intikhaabi Taariikhi Kashmiir, to restore the original nomenclature, this is an English translation of the Persian text. It carries extensive annotations comparing the Persian translation with the original Sanskrit text. Crypts have been cleared and discrepancies with the original pointed out. An effort has been made to bring the narrative in consonance with what the primary records said, to make it a reliable source book. Apart from references, Persian and Sanskrit texts have been also been added for ready reference at places, using the reader-friendly modification, the Rationalized Roman for Kashmiri (RRK), also devised by R L Bhat. The work traces deviations in the narrative and presents ways to correct them. Study of Intikhaabi Taariikhi Kashmiir should aid the student and the researcher to pin point the deviations in the narrative of Kashmir history and facilitate them to anchor it on a stout foundation, it must stand on.

Intikhaabí Taaríikhí
Kashmír

Intikhaabi Taariikhi Kashmīr

The English translation
of the text
of the Persian translation
of Sanskrit Histories (Raajataranginiis)
ordered by
Mugal Emperor Akbar
also known as *Munich Manuscript*

R L Bhat

Intikhaabi Taariikhi Kashmiir (Munich Manuscript)

R L Bhat

Gulshan Books Kashmir 2016

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise), without the prior permission of the Author/Publisher.

The views and opinions expressed in this book are the author's own and the facts are as reported by him which have been verified to the extent possible, and the publishers are not in any way liable for the same.

© R L Bhat

ISBN : 978-81-8339-425-3



Residency Road, Srinagar-190001, Kashmir, India.

www.gulshanbooks.com, gulshanpub@rediffmail.com

Published by:

Sheikh Ajaz for Gulshan Books Kashmir, chairmangulshan@gmail.com

Distributors:

Sheikh Mohammad Usman & Sons

Booksellers, Publishers and Distributors

Residency Road, Srinagar-190001, Kashmir.

Branch Office:

Madina Chowk, Gawkadal, Srinagar-190001, Kashmir.

*To remain ignorant
of things that happened before you were born
is to remain a child.*

Marcus Tullius Cicero
(Maarkas Ttyuuliyas Sisarov – 106-43 BCE)

Dedicated
to
those who love their troth
and
live it,
too.

Key used to Transcribe
Hindi/Urdu/Persian Words
As Per The Rationalised Roman Scheme¹

A. Vowels:

			e	o		
a	i	u	ee	oo	ri	n
aa	ii	uu	ai	av	rri	ah

Vowel usage is as per the following prototypes

Lower case	English word	Prototype words			
a	another	Jal	(water)	Akbar	
aa	father	Jaal	(net)	Baabar	
ee	pay	Jeel	(jail)	Ksheemindar	
i	bit	Jil	(meet)	Simha Deeva	
ii	bee	Jiil	(lake)	Jahaangiir	
oo	bone	Khool	(open)	Koottaa Deevii	
u	look	Pul	(bridge)	Parmaanuk	
uu	tool	Fuul	(flower)	Suuha Deeva	
ai	tie	Tairaak	(swimmer)	Zainulaabdiin	
av	tau	Avshadhi	(medicine)	Abhinav Gupt	
n	angle	Aansuu	(tears)	Kanchana Chakra	
ah	Ah!	Gunah	(sin)	Fatah Shah	
ri	trip	Kripaa	(kindnss)	Nunda Rishi	

1. R L Bhat, 2013, Rationalized Roman for Kashmiri, Substance Publishers, Jammu

I) **hypen (-)**, is used:

- i) between two successive vowels to designate a full svar (vowel) following a consonant with matraa, e.g. Kau-aa (crow).
- ii) to separate double consonants succeeding each other. (Urdu tashdiid). as in *bach-cha*, *Al-lah*;
- iii) between aa (a-a) to denote urdu 'ain'
- iv) after **dd**, and **ddh** (to form **dd-**, **ddh-** which represent the (**dd-a**) sound as in *ghadd-aa*, *paddh-aa*

II) **tilde '~** is used to denote nasalization as in *haa~*, *Kahaa~*;

III) **'e'** is the short form of **'ee'**. It is used to indicate the phonetic effect of Urdu diacritical mark **'zeer'** at the end of a word indicating possessive case e.g. *Fikre fardaa*, *aatash kada-e Iran*.

IV) Similarly **'o'** is the short variant of the RRK sound **'oo'** used to denote the phonetic element in words like *gulo bulbul*.

B. Consonants have been used as per the following:

k	(kaam)	kh	(kheel)	g	(gool)	gh	(ghar)
ch	(chaal)	chh	(chheelaa)	j	(joogii)	jh	(jhuulaa)
tt	(ttaal)	tth	(ttheelaa)	dd	(ddoor)	ddh	(ddhakkan)
t	(taal)	th	(theelaa)	d	(dookhaa)	dh	(dhan
p	(paar)	f	(feel)	b	(bool)	bh	(bhaarat)
y	(yaar)	r	(reel)	l	(loog)	v	(vaalmiikii)
sh	(shahar)	s	(seeth)	h	(hoonii)	n	(naakhun)
ksh	(kshamaa)	tr	(treesatth)	gy	(gyaanii)	m	(maalik)

I. Different letters of Roman alphabet, except **W** and **X** which are not used, denote the respective sounds as if they were without the vowel sound, they are uttered with.

- II. 'f' and 'ph' stand for the two variants of the sound as in 'fixed' and 'foolish' e.g. Urdu "*fan*" – art, and Hindi "*phuul*" – flower.
- III. 'k' is used to denote all the sounds corresponding to it, ('q' may be used to distinguish the 'qaaf' sounds, in Urdu words, if insisted upon)
- IV. Ch gives the sound as in '*child*'. Addition of h i.e. 'chh' gives the aspirated counterpart as in the Hindi word for *umbrella* (*chhaataa*), Scottish name *Lochinvar*
- V. t, d, are used for the soft sound only
- VI. doubling of t, d i.e. tt and dd, is used to denote the hard counterparts of the sound as in *tt-ttuutta*, *dd-toodda*;
- VII. 'h' added to t, d and tt, dd, gives aspirated sound *th-thaalii*, *tth-tthandda*; ddh – ddhakkan
- VIII. Hyphen (-) is added after dd, and ddh (dd- , ddh- to give the (dd-a) sound as in *ghadd-aa*, *paddh-aa*

1. Consonant differentiations used:

ch-chal (<i>walk</i>)	chh-chhal (<i>deceit</i>)
d-daayii (<i>mid-wife</i>)	dh-dhoobii (<i>washer-man</i>)
dd-ddar (<i>fear</i>)	ddh-ddhak (<i>cover</i>)
t-taalii (<i>clapping</i>)	th-thaalii (<i>plate</i>)
tt-ttaang (<i>leg</i>)	tth-ttheelaa (<i>wheel-barrow</i>)

Abbreviations Used

To avoid the repetition of the full names of the many works of reference used here, they are often referred to by abbreviations. These are as follows:

Aini Akbari			Abul Fazl (English <i>tr.</i>)	AA
Bahaaristaan Shaahii			(English <i>tr.</i>)	BS
History of Kashmir			A Q Rafiqi	HoK
Raajataranginii			Kalhana Pandit	RTK
			(English <i>tr.</i> Stein)	
Raajataranginii			Raajyanka Joonaraaja	RTJ
			(Sanskrit text, Kaul)	
Raajataranginii			Shriivara Pandit (Sanskrit	RTS
			text, Kaul)	
Raajataranginii			Shuka Pandit (Sanskrit	RTSH
			text, Kaul)	
Rationalized Roman	for	R L Bhat		RRK
Kashmiri				
Munich Manuscript			(Persian text)	MM
Muntakhabul Tavaariikh			O K Badaayyunii	MT
			(Urdu <i>tr.</i>)	
Taariikhi Sayyid Alii			Sayyid Alii (Persian	TSA
			text)	
Taariikhi Haidar	Malik		(Persian text)	THMC
Chaadduurah				
Taariikhi Hasan				
			Piir Hasan Khoyihaamii	TH
			(Persian text)	
Taariikh Rashiidii			Mirzaa Haidar Duglaat	TR
			(English <i>tr.</i>)	
Tohfatul Ahbaab			(English <i>tr.</i>)	TA
Vaakaati Kashmiir			Muhammad	Azm VK
			Dyadama'ry (Persian text)	

Abbreviations used for different eras are as follows:

Christian Era (=anno domini, AD)	CE
Before Christian Era (=before Christ, BC)	BCE
Hijri Era (= hijri, anno hijri, AH)	HE
Lavkik Era (=lavkik)	LE
Saptarishi Era (=saptarishii)	SE
Bikarmi Era (= bikarmi)	BE

Contents

1. A Word, If You Please	i
2. Raajataranginii Persian translation	vii
3. Raajataranginii of Kalhana	1
Book I	1
Book II	19
Book III	25
Book IV	35
Book V	45
Book VI	51
Book VII	57
Book VIII	68
4. Raajataranginii of Joonaraaja	82
5. Raajataranginii of Shriivara Pandit	143
Book I	143
Book II	154
Book III	158
Book IV	183
6. Raajataranginii Shuka Pandit	191
Book I	191
Book II	200
7. Bibliography	208

Contents

i
vii
1
1
19
25
35
45
51
57
68
83
113
143
156
158
160
167
191
200
208

Introduction
Abbreviations

1. The History of the
2. The History of the

3. The History of the

4. The History of the

A Word, If You Please!

In Kashmir history we are faced with historical ironies. Kashmir has a distinctive status in the Indian subcontinent for having a continuous historical tradition. While Kalhana Pandit is lauded for his strikingly modernist attitude to historiography, he was in no way the innovator there. Kalhana stood at the head of a long chain of historians, who had chronicled the affairs of the land since antiquity. While the earliest extant record takes after the puranic tradition, others had written proper historical accounts which Kalhana put on firm scientific lines. The upheavals that overturned Kashmir, a couple of centuries after Kalhana, destroyed these pristine records. It is a tribute to the superior *kaavya* of Kalhana that his work survived the odds, bringing us the great tradition and troth.

Equally remarkable is the fact that the subsequent historiographers not only followed Kalhana's lead but also carried the tradition forward without impinging on the earlier narrative. This is probably an unheard thing in the world historiography that succeeding historians remain contented to carry on the good work without seeking, as the saying goes, to rediscover the moon. They do not rewrite Kalhana or paraphrase him, but leave his account alone and add the details of subsequent eras to it. This is the *Raajatarangini* series of Sanskrit histories of Kashmir, comprised of five works, one of which has unfortunately been lost.

This tradition of historiography continued till the Mugal conquest of Kashmir in the last quarter of the 16th century. That is when the Persian chronicles begin and so does the irony.

Persian chronicles began in a fitful way in the mid 16th century, but of the first one we have only a passing reference in the first extant Persian history of Kashmir, the *Taariikhi Sayyid Alii*, written in 1579 CE. TSA is half hagiography and half history written in the hagiographic style. This was followed by a flood of hagiographies by the disciples of Shaikh Hamza, written in the last two decades of the 16th century. The first was by Baabaa Nasiib Gaazii, though his brother Baabaa Amiin Raina too wrote one later. These same disciples of Shaikh Hamza were instrumental in getting Akbar to annex Kashmir. Though Akbar got history of the last decades preceding Mughals written by in Sanskrit, Persian began to rampage the official circles of Kashmir after the Mugal conquest.

17th century saw two histories, *Bahaaristaan Shaahii* (BS) and *Taariikhi Haidar Malik Chaadduurah* (THMC), and dozens of hagiographies, all written in Persian. The first irony is that discarding the objectivity of Kalhana, the Persian chroniclers took heavily to hagiographies for material, interpretation and insight too. Thus armed the Persian chroniclers even imposed the name Lal, on a nameless *yooginii* mentioned by Joonaraaja, in connection with Sharashaattaka *a.k.a* Shahaabudiin. The more ironic fact is that they made history a handmaid of hagiographic quest. The impartiality of the Sanskrit historians was a goner as the Persian chroniclers declared that their objective was the service of *diin* and glorification of *piirs* and *shaikhs*.

A consequence of this urge, or the collateral cost of it, was that veracity of the account became a subsidiary concern. Kalhana had used a host of materials, previous records, epigraphs and a thorough familiarity with the terrain to write his chronicle. 700 years after him, an Austrian scholar was able to accurately trace the places and pointers in his account. Besides, the last two books of Kalhana and more than half of Joonaraaja, and the full accounts

of Shriivara, Praajya Bhatta and Shuka are eyewitness accounts. Fairness, objectivity and veracity are a characteristic of this historiography. In contrast, the Persian chroniclers said what they wanted without a care or compunction. What basis was there to affix the name of Lal to the *yooginii* of Joonaraaja's account? From what source did the chroniclers get whole dialogues of Rinchana, which they relate? What reason did they have to overturn the accounts of earlier Sanskrit historians? In fact, what need did they have to rewrite the accounts the Sanskrit historians had written from firsthand knowledge? Was this penchant to rewrite the whole past to fulfil the urges? Each propagandist often deems his own service better, worthier and more deserving of the recompense.

Another great irony of the Persian chronicles is that while they vex eloquent on the events that took place centuries before them, they do not write of their own times, refusing to talk of what they would have been witness to. However, they are very forthcoming on the affairs of the *shaikhs* and *piirs* of their times, which again tells of their predilection for hagiographic indulgence rather than the study of history. This culminates in a whole volume devoted to the hagiographic dealings by the last comprehensive Persian historian of Kashmir, Piir Hasan, whose *Taariikh* was written contemporaneously with Stein's monumental work on Kalhana's *Raajataranginii*.

It may be mentioned here that Steins work was not the first translation of *Raajataranginii*. The second half of 19th century saw many translations of the work of Kalhana. Decades before Stein, Jogesh Chunder Dutt had translated the *Raajataranginiis* into English. Accordingly, the Sanskrit histories i.e. the *Raajataranginii* series came to be known extensively through the comprehensive English translations in the 19th and 20th centuries of Christian era. The same cannot be said of the Persian histories. But there lies another irony. The Persian chronicles have been the main source of the history of Kashmir. People have been using them, paraphrasing them, and, in the words of Srikanth Kaul,

'metaprashing' them to create the historical narrative of Kashmir. Yet their original accounts remain obscure even to this day.

It was only in the last quarter of the 20th century that people in Kashmir became aware of a Persian manuscript, which gave an 'account' of the history of Kashmir. The manuscript obtained as a microfilm from Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Digitalisat-Bestellung from Munchener, or the German city Munich, came to be known as Munich Manuscript. In the 1970's it was a virtual discovery. Munich Manuscript is actually a Persian translation of the Raajataranginii series ordered by Akbar in the last decade of 16th century after his conquest of Kashmir. Contrary to the ubiquitous, often devout, claims of Raajataranginii having been translated into Persian much earlier, this is the only Persian translation that is available.

The Persian translation has been referred to historians of all hues. It would have formed the basic document on the ancient and earlier history of Kashmir available to the later Persian chroniclers of Kashmir. This manuscript is being presented here in its entirety, in English translation. The text has been extensively compared with the original account of the Sanskrit histories to present a comprehensive perspective on this seminal 'history in Persian'. Munich manuscript, its characteristics and its significance for the historical narrative of Kashmir has been discussed in the work. Suffice it here to mention that this is an attempt to throw full scale light, not only on the history of Kashmir, but more importantly on the historiography that has moulded the narrative of Kashmir history.

Before I commend this work to the discerning reader, I acknowledge the support and inspiration of my family, especially the youngsters Priyanka, Arushi, Aditya and Amish, who are the first audience for my work; they want to know and I keep telling.

I must mention the constant communion with Pradeep Koul Khudballi. With him there I feel strong to trudge arenas where angels would not tread. Equally encouraging has been the active interest of Dr Ramesh Kumar Taimiri in this and my other

undertakings in Kashmir history. Many of the books referred here have been loaned by him, for which I am much grateful.

I also thank Sujeet Kumar Bhat for his hard work in seeing these tasks through.

And with that, dear reader, it is over to you!

Jammu
zeetthu' aa'ttham, 2015 CE

R L Bhat

RAAJATARANGINII

The

Persian translation

Persian translation of Raajataranginii has been talked of since the time of Shriivara, the late 15th century courtier and chronicler of Zainulaabdiin. Shriivara says that Zainaabdiin got many Sanskrit books translated into Persian for the benefit of the immigrant Muslims, 'so that they [could] read [them] in their own tongue'.¹ Among the list of books is 'Raajataranginii'.² Shriivara is an eye-witness and his account cannot be taken lightly. Joonaraaja's work was still in writing and Shriivara's own work may not have begun by the time, he speaks of. It is reasonable to assume that Shriivara implies the work of Kalhana Pandit.

It, however, is not clear what the exact nature of this translation was, e.g. whether it was finally done, whether the whole of the work was translated or just some parts of it. Shriivara, who mentions the translation of Raajataranginii among a host of Sanskrit books the king got translated, does not give the name of the translator, either. Had it been Mulaa Ahmad, we'd have expected a mention by name, since the personage was a co-courtier of his. By sheer conjecture the translation has been attributed to Mulaa Ahmad, the well known poet of Zainulaabdiin's court.³ In sharp

1. Shriivara, RTS I:5:86

2. RTS I:5:85

3. Piir Hasan Khoyihaamii, 1956, *Taariikhi Hasan*, Persian text, Research Deptt, Srinagar vol. I, II

contrast to the importance such a work would've commanded, at least among the then Muslim populace of the valley, the Persian chroniclers are unaware of it.

Sayyid Alii the author of first extant Persian history, writing a full century after Zainulaabdiin, is unaware of any Persian translation of Raajataranginii. Nor is Abul Fazl, Akbar's courtier and chronicler, aware of this work. He in fact, tells that on his first visit to the valley Akbar was presented with a set of the Sanskrit histories of Kashmir – Raajatarangini Series – which he promptly ordered to be translated. This endeavour shall be discussed in detail below.

The point to be noted here, is that nobody in the centuries following Zainulaabdiin, including the Persian chroniclers who wrote in 16-18th centuries, is aware of any Persian translation of Raajataranginii save the one got done by Akbar. While Sayyid Alii, writing a decade before Akbar's conquest of Kashmir, does not speak of the Hindu period, the later Persian chroniclers include it in the form it was made available to them through Akbar's translation. This translation, it appears was not available to the early 17th century author of Baharistaan Shaahii; he gives a disjointed account of the Hindu period either from folk-knowledge or a cursory study of the Sanskrit histories.¹ Haidar Malik, writing a decade or so later, speaks of the Mugal king getting the Sanskrit histories translated into Persian and even aiding his liege lord, Jahaangiir, in it.² His description of the history of the Hindu period is a summary reproduction of the Akbar's translation. As we shall discuss below, the available Persian translation does mention of its having been done on the orders of Jahaangiir Paadashah.³ However, the colophon gives the cat away telling that the translation was done on Akbar's orders, in 999 *hijri*, during his reign.⁴

1. Bahaaristaani Shaahii, English translation, 1991, K N Pandit, pages 1-9
2. Taariikhi Haidar Malik Chaadduurah (THMC), Persian text, page 2
3. Munich Manuscript, Persian text, digital image 12
4. Munich Manuscript, Persian text, digital image 189

While Sanskrit continued to be the literary language in Kashmir till the late 18th century, Persian began to gain ground, by the mid-16th century. After the Mugal conquest, their language i.e. Persian became the official language of the conquered Kashmir. The last Sanskrit histories of Kashmir were written towards the end of the 16th century as mentioned in this Persian translation itself. Thereafter, Persian ruled the roost. Though there is ample evidence that Sanskrit continued to be read and written in Kashmir till the 20th century, Persian gradually became the language of record in Mugal Kashmir and all the histories written in the succeeding centuries are in Persian.

As such, the Persian translation got done by Akbar, became the reference work for the earlier period. It, accordingly, has exercised great influence on the medieval historiography in Kashmir. This becomes very significant – some would say ‘sinister’ – when we find that the translation was inaccurate, interpolated and carried details added to the record of the original Sanskrit histories. While the inaccuracies and interpolations by the Persian translator are found in the record of Kalhana too, they become signal in the post-Kalhana Raajataranginii series, creating a thoroughly distorted narrative. The later Persian chronicles, particularly, Dyadama’ry’s *Vaakaati Kashmiir*, have been the virtual templates for the modern notions about the pre-Islamic and early Muslim kingships of Kashmir. This fact underscores the significance of the Persian translation got done by Akbar in the historiography of Kashmir. The translation thus used and still available is the *intikhaabi taariikhi kashmiir* or Munich Manuscript.

Beginning with the extensive work by Pandit Kalhana (RTK, earliest times to 1149 CE), the Sanskrit histories saw four continuations viz. that of Joonaraja (RTJ, 1150 – 1450 CE), Shriivara (RTS, 1459 – 1486 CE), Praajya Bhatta (RTP, 1486 – 1513 CE) and Shuka Pandita (RTSH, 1510 – 1538 CE). Of these we know Praajya Bhatta’s work only by its mention by Shuka Pandit in the beginning of his work. Excepting this lost record

of some 30 years, we have in the Raajataranginii a continuous Sanskrit history of Kashmir, till its acquisition by Mugal Empire in 1587 CE.¹

Translations into Sanskrit and Persian were undertaken during Zainulaabdiin's time. Shriivara himself translated the Persian verse legend of Yuusuf Zulaikhaa into Sanskrit as *katha kootuk*, which is the only extant Persian work of the era. He tells that king Zainulaabdiin caused the *Yogavashishtt. Raajataranginii, dashaavtaar charita, katha sarit saagar* 'and others including works on astronomy, medicine' etc.² The first Persian history of Kashmir, *Taariikhi Sayyid Alii*, makes no mention of having seen any Persian translation of Raajataranginii and calls it a chronicle of 'kings of Hind'.³ Abul Fazl tells that when Akbar entered Kashmir, in 1587, he was presented with a set of the Raajataranginis, which he ordered to be translated into Persian.⁴ At another place Abul Fazl tells that Shah Muhammad Shahaabaadii translated Raajatarangiini into Persian, on Akbar's orders.⁵

Obdul Kaadir Badaayuunii, *munshi* in Akbar's court, also wrote *Mantakhabul Tavaariikh*, a history of Muslim rule in India, on the sly. In it he criticized Akbar for deviations from Islaam, the true faith. Badaayuunii says that his objective was to record the deviant activities at the court for the future devout Muslims to note and to show that he did all he could for *diini Islaam*.⁶ When Jahaangiir became king and heard of Badaayuunii's work he called his sons and demanded the manuscript.⁷ They denied any knowledge of it. Subsequently, the work came to light though

1. 1507 *Shaakaa* = 1587 CE, as per Shuka
2. Shriivara, RTS I:5: 85
3. TSA, Persian text, page 30
4. Aini Akbari, Abul Fazl, English tr. H S Jarret, Atlanta Publishers And Distributors, New Delhi, Vol II, pages 357-76
5. Aini Akbari, Abul Fazl, English tr., H Blochman, Atlanta Publishers And Distributors, New Delhi, Vol I, Page 112
6. Muntakhabul Tavaariikh, *ibid.*, Vol I, preface pages xxii-xxiii and Vol III page 611-12
7. Muntakhabul Tavaariikh, *ibid.*, Vol I, page xxi

there was no trace of it till the middle of Jahangiir's reign, 1616 CE, when *Maasiri Rahiimii* was written.¹ In *Mantakhabul Tavaariikh* Badaayunii confirms what Abul Fazl said of the Raajataranginiis and the Persian translation, including that he did the rehash in two months.²

Badaayuuni tells that one translated work found was named '*bahrulasmaar*', of which only two parts had been translated and that he had to translate the work anew.³ Haidar Malik Chaadduurah, a Kashmiri noble in the court of Jahaangiir, wrote a history of Kashmir in Persian on the orders of Jahaangiir. Therein he says that he got the Raajataranginii translated on the orders of Jahaangiir.⁴

Srikanth Kaul edited the Sanskrit text of the Raajataranginiis of Raajyanka Joonaraaja, Pandit Shriivara and Shuka Pandit, in two volumes, viz. 'Raajataranginii of Shriivara and Shuka' published in 1966 and 'Raajataranginii of Joonaraja' published in 1967 by Visheshwaranand Research Institute. He discusses the works and source materials in the Raajataranginii of Joonaraaja.⁵ Speaking of available Persian translation, he tells of one Persian Translation (PT), and its epitome *intikhaabi-taariikhi-kashmir*; he further says that two manuscripts of the epitome are extant, one in Munich and another in Paris.⁶ Later, describing these manuscripts, he tells of PT being 131 folios with 17-19 lines to a page.⁷ That would be $262 \times 18 = 4,716$ lines. Intikhaab is described as 90 folios with 14-15 lines to a page.⁸ That would be $180 \times 15 = 2700$ lines. Thus *Intikhaab* is a little more than half of Persian translation.

1. Aini Akbari, English tr. *ibid.*, Vol I, fn page 111

2. Muntakhabul Tavaariikh, *ibid.*, Vol. II, page 318

3. Muntakhabul Tavaariikh (MT), *ibid.*, page 344

4. Taariikhi Haidar Malik Chaadduurah (THMC), Persian text, page 2

5. Srikanth Kaul, 1967, Raajataranginii of Joonaraaja, pages 1-30.

6. Kaul, Raajataranginii of Joonaraaja, pages 2-3

7. Kaul, *ibid.*, page 8

8. Kaul, *ibid.*, page 9

Kaul's description of *Intikhaabi Taariikhi Kashmiir* tallies with the work in hand (folios 90, written pages 180, lines 14-15). He tells that microfilms of two manuscripts of *Intikhaab* were obtained by Research Department, Srinagar from Aus. Der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München and Biblotheque Notianale, Paris.¹ He further says that Mohibul Hasan has used the *intikhaab* under the title Munich Manuscript.² This manuscript is the subject of this work.

As indicated above, the *Intikhaab* is a little more than half of the Persian translation. Kalhana's work ran into eight books. Book VIII of Kalhana is larger than all the three later Raajataranginiis (Joonaraaja, 976 *shlookas* + Shriivara, 2240 *shlookas* + Shuka 399 *shlookas*). A break-up of the folios of the Persian translation, tells that it is neither full translation of the Sanskrit histories nor proportionate, as reflected in the following description³ of the folios by Kaul:

Kalhana	—	39
Joonaraaja	—	93
Shriivara	—	69
Shuka	—	64
		<u>263</u> folios

Distribution of the folios devoted to various Raajataranginiis in the Munich Manuscript shows the same contraction and disproportionality to the original account:

Kalhana	—	83 pages
Joonaraaja	—	58 pages
Shriivara	—	21 pages
Shuka	—	19 pages
		<u>181</u> pages

Kaul speaks of Kalhana and Shriivara parts being incomplete in PT. It, however, is not clear whether Kaul is speaking of the matter in specific or general terms. This omission is obviously

1. Kaul, *ibid.*, page 3
2. Kaul, *ibid.*, foot note, I, page 3
3. Kaul *ibid.*, page 8-9.

greater in the main body, i.e. Kalhana's Raajataranginii, but it is no less in the later three updations of Joonaraaja, Shriivara, and Shuka. As it is, PT does not include the two most extensive of Sanskrit records in their entirety. Munich Manuscript, or the *intikhaab*, is a selection and the Persian translator has omitted details/*shlookas* all though and a pick-n-choose selection is evident all over.

Though the nature of selection implies that some parts of the original texts would be left out, the *intikhaab* leaves out two entire portions from the Sanskrit texts of the Raajataranginiis of Kalhana and Shriivara. Probably, these parts were missing from the original text of Raajataranginiis that had been handed out for translation, for there is no apparent reason for the Persian translator to leave them out. In the first case, nearly 300 *shlookas*¹ covering the reigns of kings Kuvalayaapiidda, Vajraaditya, Prithviipiidda Samgraamapiidda and Jayaapiidda, who ruled approximately between 735-81 CE, have been left out in the Persian translation.² Jayaapiidda came close to Lalitaaditya in glory, grandeur and rule. The account of his reign has also been omitted.

Next, *Taranga-3* of Shriivara's work which describes Hasan Shah's reign (1472-84 CE) is missing in Munich Manuscript.³ This fact has been duly indicated at the appropriate place. In fact, this work includes selections from the original work of Shriivara there, completing the record. Shrikanth Kaul has noted that this chapter is missing in both Munich and Paris manuscripts of ITK.⁴ Again the omission would have been on the part of the Persian translator and not Badaayuunii. At the very least these omissions tell that the Persian translator was not very particular about the text. Though the text presented to Akbar, they by no means were the only copies of the work available. Being a Kashmiri and working in Kashmir, Muhammad Shahaabaadii could have

1. RTK, IV: 372-659

2. Munich Manuscript (MM), digital [image](#) 56

3. MM, digital image 166 line 9

4. Kaul, *ibid.*, page 9

found the manuscripts without much difficulty. Clearly, he did not attempt to find the missing parts.

Further, Kaul gives the beginning and the end of the *intikhaabi taariikhi kashmiir* which is exactly as in the manuscript translated here.¹ The beginning of the Munich Manuscript says:

Ba hukmi amri dil paziir shahanshaah Jahaangiir shuruu dar tahriiri Intikhaabi Taariikhi Kashmiir mii ravad... [On the orders of Jahaangiir the writing of *Intikhaabi Taariikhi Kashmiir* begins...]

This, coupled with what Haidar Malik Chaadduurah has said in his *taariik*, indicates that this selection was made on the orders of Jahaangiir. However, the colophon of the work tells that the work was completed in the year 999 HE (1591 CE)², which is the date Badaayuunii says he completed the rehash of the translated work on Akbar's order.³

The colophon also says that the translation of the history of the period following Shamas Shah, which had been got written annually in Sanskrit on Akbar's orders, had not been ordered.⁴ Accordingly, the Persian translation of the Sanskrit histories the *Intikhaab* ends there i.e. with the work of Shuka Pandit.

All through the Persian translator has added descriptions, legends on his own. If these interpolations have been reproduced from the PT, as it appears from certain passages indicated in the body of the Persian text, it is clear that the translation was far from genuine. In any case it is not proportionate. Kaul has noted the wide variance of the Persian Translation and the original account.⁵ Comparing it with the Persian histories, he encounters further travesty from the record. Speaking of the Persian Translation

1. Kaul, *ibid.*, page 23

2. M M, digital image 189-90

3. M T, *ibid.*, page 318

4. M M, digital image 190

5. Kaul, *ibid.*, page 25

and the Raajatarangini of Joonaraaja, Kaul says: *What the Mugal historians say is not the same as what the PT says and what the latter says is not the same as what Joonaraaja says.*¹ One has often been reminded of Elliot's pithy remarks that Persian chroniclers rarely write with an impartial bent and their fidelity to the source they may be using is rarer still.

These observations are borne out in line after line of Munich Manuscript and have been duly indicated in the footnotes. The variations become profuse as MM enters the post-Kalhana era, especially when the Muslim kings appear on the arena of Kashmir history. They bear out Elliot's remarks on the lack of authenticity in Persian histories. Kaul has says: The PT is also available in an epitomized form entitled *Intikhaab Taariikhi Kashmiir* in which the information unfavourable to Muslims is generally eschewed.²

A telling instance of this is the entire omission in Munich Manuscript³ of the humiliating defeat of a Gaznavid king by Jayasimha, described in detail by Joonaraaja, in the very beginning of his work.⁴ Daliance of a different kind, also spoken of by the aforementioned analysts, is also seen in ample measure in MM. the Persian translator controverts the original account, and gives what can only be called white lies. Likewise, the description of Shrii Kootta's rule in MM is not in conformity with what the original account of Joonaraaja says. As the account enters the later periods, where more details are available in accounts of both Joonaraaja and Shriivara, the Persian translation contracts the information, rounds up details and misreports facts. An illustration of these can be seen at the last pages of this work, where the details given by Shuka Pandit have been given in foot notes to the bewildering single-line rounding up in Munich Manuscript.

-
1. H M Elliot and John Dowson, 1867, *History of India by Its Own Historians*, Vol I, Sir Elliots's Preface pages xxii-xxiv
 2. Kaul *ibid.*, page 23.
 3. M M, digital image 95-96
 4. RTJ, *sh.*, 32-36

So what is the significance of the Persian translation and its selection? Here, it must be kept in mind that it is not an original document of history! When the originals become available, its significance recedes – *aab aamad tamiim barkhaast*, as the Persian saying goes. Kaul also reaches the same conclusion.¹ One cannot but agree with his description of Persian translation: “it is neither a *metaphase* not a *resume*, but it is a *paraphrase with latitude*.”² Then, there is the fact of the Persian translation deviating from the original rather widely. However, these deviations of the Persian translation have in their pet words, *bisyaar* and *bee intihaa* implication for how inaccurately the history of Kashmir, medieval and modern, has been portrayed. All Persian histories of Kashmir, excepting *taariikhi sayyid alii*, were written after the Akbar’s translation.³ With the Persian translation as source book, the *taariikhs* reproduced the interpolations and inaccuracies therein, as authentic history. Together with the heavy borrowing from hagiographies, the interpolations and inaccuracies have become the dominant narrative of the Persian histories of Kashmir, and thence the modern historiography of Kashmir.

Here a basic tenet of historiography needs reiteration. History is always one person’s account. Whether it is Herodotus, Kalhana, or Ibu Khaldun, it is one person writing, recording and reproducing. The singular redemption there is the particular person’s study, approach and, what must be called, an intellectual honesty. The present day student of history has more means available to reach the kernel than any earlier historians could’ve dreamt of. That allows us to study the portrayal of the past from different sources and perspectives. Half a century ago, everything that came to hand by the way of a record of the earlier times was lapped up with blind enthusiasm. Manuscripts were hard to come

1. Kaul, *ibid.*, page 8

2. Kaul, *ibid.*, page 23

3. Kaul, in a footnote says: The *Taariikhi Sayyid Alii* and *Bahaaristaani Shaahii* are older than the Persian translation (*Raajataranginii* of Joonaraaja, *ibid.*, Introduction, page 25). This is not correct. BS was written around the second decade of 17th century CE, which is about a quarter century after the Persian translation ordered by Akbar.

by, and the people accessing them had a privilege, others couldn't command.

Though Stein had started the tradition of critical analysis of the available manuscripts, comparing them and editing the text before embarking on the translation, the practice did not quite take off, at least with respect to the Kashmir historiography. Even as learned a historian as G M D Suufii seems to take the Persian manuscripts he had access to, as newly revealed gospel; to 'take just one example, he cites works of late 19th century, based on an 18th century hagiography, to found events of 14th century, without batting a critical eyelid.¹ Suufii was probably, the first Kashmiri to receive extensive training in modern methods of historiography. Not only does he overlook them in his voluminous work on Kashmir history, but he actually declares a patent partiality to Islaam.² That it makes the whole undertaking a missionary enterprise goes without saying, but the point is how could he do so and still call himself as a modern historiographer?

This refusal to exercise a critical approach is evident even half a century after Suufii. In his translation of the first Persian history of Kashmir, A Q Rafiqi actually omits words and mistranslates whole passages.³ Unfortunately, even the trained historians, here, ignore the principles of modern scholarship. Researchers are not reformers; they cannot go by sectarian obligations, not even seek to proffer explanations or apologies for the events in the record. Nobody can alter the text being studied or translated.

The primacy of sources is a cardinal point here; the earlier records take precedence, and the subsequent works written with the primary account in view are secondary and must not alter the details of primary source without any authentic source for their assertions. This becomes a must in the case of translations, where the translator is simply transferring a record in one language

1. Suufii, *Kashiir*, Vol I, Page 83

2. GMD Suufii, *Kashiir*, Vol I, chapter III

3. A Q Rafiqi, HoK pages 35, 121, 131-32, 134 etc.

into another. We could safely add a generalization here that the Persian historians rarely do so, but we find that even the modern historiographers writing in the *lingua franca* of our times, operate in the same devious way. Dowson Elliot and pointed to it in the overall Indian context; we have enough evidence to assert that historiography in Kashmir is no exception. Munich Manuscript helps us to nail the deviations, and affords an opportunity to straighten the records and the narrative. That is the greatest significance of this document.

TEXT

همچنانکه عمل دیوانست از آب بیرون آمده مردم اطراف و جوانب را آزار میبخشد
 و دانشمندان دیوداران مقام می بوده و چنانچه عبادت از بهیست و یک
 روزه از چهار چک که نزدیک اهل چهند مقرر و تفصیل شمار مدت هر چک
 در کتب ایشان مذکور است و این دیو را برهما دعا کرده بود که نادر آب شده
 بکشد شود و کسی بر و غالب نخواهد آمد و کتب نام غالب پیر مار که خیر بر هر
 وقتی که زیارت معابد میرفت بمیکه نام کو بهیست رسید آن ولایت را خواست
 و سبب آنرا از مردم اطراف پرسید جواب گفتند که جلد بهونام دیوی مردم
 خوار مردم را بقتل آورده باز بمیان آب در می انداختند که بپزد بران مردم بدرد
 آمده هزار سال در نویندن که موصفت نزدیک بهیره پور عبادت کرد
 و معابدی از کثرت عبادت و ریاضت برورحم آورده سبب آن عبادت را
 از پرسید او گفت بمنجوا هم که شتر جلد بهو از بمقام دفع شود معابد ایشان و بر
 برقع او فرستاد بشن تا صبح سال او جنگ کرد و کاری ساخت از جهت آنکه
 او را آب بمیکه بخت و دفع او نمیشد آفرینش در نواحی را میگویند که آن کوه
 را که ستر راه آب بود به چکر که نام ملاحت برید و آب راه بدر رفتن پیدا
 و زمین تمام پیدا شد و بشن جلد بهو را بعد از رفتن آب بقتل آورد و گش میزد نام

الحمد لله رب العالمین والصلوة والسلام علی خیر خلقه محمد و آلک اجمعین و بعد بحکم
 احد پندیرش هفتاد و چهار کتب شروع در تحریر انتخاب تاریخ کشمیر و در مخفی ماند
 که مورخان هند و العمدہ علیہم جنس میگویند کہ نام کشمیر اول سستی سرود
 و چون سستی نام یار پتی کہ زن مہادیو و از کوہ ہمالیہ پیدا شدہ است سستی نام
 دارد و در حوض بزرگ را کہ خدا فرین در میان دو کوہ باشد میگویند و زمین
 شہر کشمیر حوضی بود کہ محل برون رفتن آب نہ داشتہ و در میان این کوہ ہما جمع
 میشود و پار پتی در اینجا می بودہ بدینجہتہ او را سستی یعنی حوض یار پتی میگویند
 اند و در میان آب این حوض جلہ ہونام دیوی ہوناک خونریز مسکن داشتہ

RAAJATARANGINII

Of Kalhana

Book I

Praise to the Lord of the world and laudation and salutation to Alii, the kind, the *khaliifa* of Muhammad and Allah, the Great. On the gratifying orders of King Jahaangiir, here begins *Intikhaabi Taariikhi Kashmiir*, the selection of Kashmir history.¹

Let it not remain unknown that, as the Hindu historians of the period tell it, Kashmir was initially called Satiisar. The reason for this nomenclature is that Paarbatii, the consort of Mahaadeeva, born in Himachal, was called Satii. She lived at the head of a huge pond created by the Lord between two mountains, which was the land Kashmir. As there was no outlet for the water between these mountains, the water gathered there. Hence, it was called the Satiisar i.e. the Pond of *Paarbatii*. Inside the water of this pond, a

-
1. This translation into English, of the Persian translation of the original Sanskrit texts, has been kept as close to the Persian text as English syntax permitted. The Persian translation is not precise. It is interpolated. The translation is often incorrect; at times grossly so. Major deviations from original have been pointed out in foot notes below, and juxtaposed to what the original text said.

terrible giant called *Jaladbahu* [Jaloodhabhava, arisen from water] had his residence.¹

As is the wont of the giants, he would emerge from the water and attack the people living in the surroundings. For six *Mantraas* [*Manvantras*] the giant had been living there. Every *manvantra* comprises of twenty-one days, constituting the four *Jagas* [*Yugas*] as is well-known reckoning among the Hindus. The period of every *yuga* is described in their scriptures.²

This giant had prayed to Brahma that as long as he remained in water, he would not be killed, and none would overcome him.³ Once upon a time Kashyap Rishii, the son of *Maaranj* [*Naaraayan?*], who is the grandson Brahma through daughter, set out for the pilgrimage of holy shrines. He arrived at Meeru, which is the name of a (holy) mountain. He found the realm desolate and enquired of the people there. They replied that, Jaloodbhava, a cannibal giant kills the people and then hides in the water.

Kashyap grieved for those people. He prayed for a thousand years, at Navbandan, a place near Heerapurah.⁴ Mahaadeeva

1. The Persian manuscript is paginated in the traditional manner with the first word of the next folio written on the preceding page. However, the digitalized manuscript is in *jpg.*, images which are numbered. The manuscript begins with image 12., Reference to the original has been maintained by indicating the digitalized image numbers. Here ends the first page of the digitalized manuscript, http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/bsb00002989/image_12
2. This corresponds to RTK, I: 25-27. The preceeding *shlokas* describing the earlier chronicles Kalhana consulted (RTK, I: 11-14) and the other sources he used (RTK, I: 15-22) etc., have been left out in the Persian translation.
3. After a succinct description of clearing waters (RTK, I: 25-27), Raajataranginii of Kalhana Pandit gives a description of Kashmir, its *tirthas*, holy mountains, rivers and sacred springs, including a laudation of *naagas*, Vitasta, the form Deevii Satii took, the valley of Kashmir (RTK, I: 28-43). The details given here are taken from *Nilamat Puraana* added *ba sababi daliil*, as they say in Persian. It has been reproduced by the later Persian historians e.g. THMC, Persian text, page 3; VK, Persian text, page 9.
4. Navbandana (*naava-bandana*) near Heerapurah is the name of the tapering hill forming the northern boundary of Kramsara Lake (now, Koonsarnaag).

was moved at his penance and asked him the object thereof. He said, "I want the scourge of Jaloodbhava to be eliminated from this place." Mahaadeeva sent Bishan and Brahma to remove him. Bishan fought him for a hundred years but could not accomplish the task. He took refuge in the water and could not be eliminated.

Finally Bishan went to the vicinity of Baarahmula. With his *chakra*, the implement called *salaahii*, he sliced the mountain which impeded the exit of water and created an outlet for the water. Land appeared and Bishan killed Jaloodbhava after the water had flown out.¹ The land came to be called *Kash-miir* i.e. Meeru (the mountain) of Kashyap.²

Thereafter Kashyap brought Brahmans from the landmass of Hindustaan and settled them in that land so that the Brahmans would in a short time perform prayers, and ameliorate the protracted intransigence of that giant there and make amends for his cruelties, since even a little prayer mitigates suffering, greatly.

For some time the land remained under the (individual) usage of Brahmans. Then their progeny increased. A realm came into being and a ruler was needed so that they are not pestered by the enemies around. Having settled thereupon, they went to the king of Jammu, brought the king there from and imposed him upon themselves.³ To meet the eventual needs, they appointed the sixth of their produce for him.⁴ For six hundred, and fifty three

1. End of the digitalized manuscript ... image 13

2. i.e. compounding of names Kashyap and Meeru.

3. There is no mention of Jammu kings in the text of Kalhana (RTK I: 3-56). The legend, with all its inaccuracies and interpolations, has been reproduced by later Persian chronicles, *Taariikhi Haidar Malik* (THMC, Persian text, page 4), *Vaakaati Kashmiir* (VK, Persian text, page 10) etc., who add another spurious tale. None of which is found in Kalhana.

4. There is no mention of this in the original record.

years, the rule of that kingdom continued over this land.¹ Then came the war between Kooravas and Paanddavas. In that war the ruler of Kashmir was killed.²

Then the rule passed to a person called Raaja³ Aadigupnand [Goonanda I]⁴. Four thousand and thirty-seven years have passed since the counties were laid waste, in the aftermath of the war between Kooravas and Paanddavas.⁵ Since nothing of the earlier days has survived among the people, the account of the kings of Kashmir has been begun with Goonanda's reign.⁶ Goonanda I got slain at the hands of Balbadr, the brother of Kishan.⁷

His son, Raajaa Daamoodar, succeeded him.⁸ Daamoodar went to the marriage ceremony of the daughter of the king of Kandahaar.⁹ There he got slain at the hands of the people of Kishan's tribe. Then Krishan bestowed the kingship of Kashmir on Daamoodar's wife, named Jasvatii [Jashoovatii], who was

1. This is a deviant translation of *sh.* I: 51 of RTK, which says: "when 635 years of *Kaliyuga* had elapsed, Kooravas and Paanddavas lived on earth." It does not say they ruled over Kashmir.
2. The Persian translator is mistaken; the original does not say so. The king of Kashmir was killed at Mathura aiding his relative Jaraasandha (RTK I: 63). Then his son Daamoodara got killed in Gandhara. The Great War took place when Goonanda II was still an infant (RTK I: 82).
3. The Persian translator uses 'Raaja' and 'Raajaa' interchangeably. The words are not in the original text.
4. The names in the Persian translation are invariably incorrect. Some of these distortions may be due to absence of the diacritical marks, which are rarely used, and others to ambiguities of the Persio-Arabic script. We have given the name as it is in the Persian text, then put the correct name as given by Kalhana in long brackets and used the correct name wherever it appears, thereafter.
5. This number (4037 years) is not in RTK. Kalhana (RTK, I: 48-56) substantiates his chronology, with the year of the Great War, Yudhishttra's rule and reference to the year (4249 *Kaliyuga*) he wrote in.
6. Approximates to the contents of RTK, I: 57-58
7. Summation of RTK, I: 59-63
8. RTK, I: 64
9. End of the digitalized manuscript ... [image 14](#).

enceinte.¹ Following that Raajaa *Dayaal Ganand* [**Goonanda II**]², the son born to her, became the ruler of the realm. During his rule, Goonanda II treated the subjects and subordinates well. He was killed by Paanddavaas.³ After him thirty-seven persons sat on the Kashmir throne. Their names are not mentioned in the records.⁴ Then a person called Raajaa Lava became the ruler. Since, he was very kind and loving, the subjects were very contented with him. He conquered all surrounding (states) and was freed of worries on their count. He founded the fort Lava and the city Leevara and passed away.⁵

His son, Raaja *Kishan* [**Kusha**]⁶ succeeded him. He ruled for a short period and died. Raajaa *Gageendar* [**Kshageendar**], as his son was called, came to be the king. Kshageendar founded two cities Kaakapoor and *Kana* [**Khonamuusha**].⁷

After him, his son Raajaa *Sarandar* [**Sureendra**]⁸ succeeded to the throne and established his sway. He founded two localities, called *Soond* [**Sooraka**]⁹ and *Sooruu* [**Savrasa**].¹⁰ Dedicating both to the poor and destitute, he built many houses for them. He left no issue behind and the rule passed out of his family.

1. RTK, I: 70.

2. It is a corruption of the 'infant' Goonanda; the Sanskrit for child *baalak* > *baal* > *dayaal*, has become a new name. The king is Gonand II (RTK, I: 76).

3. This is incorrect. The line is a misreading of RTK I: 82, which actually says that the king, being a child, was sought neither by Kurus nor Paanddavas.

4. RTK, I: 83. It needs be noted that in 16th century nobody was aware of any work by Mulaa Ahmad.

5. This is incorrect. The original says that he bestowed the *agrahaara* of Leevara, on Ledarii, on Brahmans (RTK, I: 87).

6. RTK, I: 88.

7. RTK, I: 89. Persian writers display an almost pathological tendency to distort the original names. The name Khonamuusha still survives in the well known village Khonu'muh, near Poonpar.

8. RTK, I: 91.

9. RTK, I: 93.

10. RTK, I: 94.

Raajaa **Goodar**, who came of a different family, became the king after him. He founded two localities named Goodhar and Hastii Haal,¹ and bestowed them on the mendicants and passed away. His son Raajaa *Supran* [**Suvarna**]² succeeded him. Suvarna built a canal, known after his name, bringing waters from afar. Aadavan village was founded with those waters.³

His son, Raaja **Janak** attained to the kingship after him. Janak obtained great glory, to the extent that people compare him to Raaja Janak, the father of (*Maataa*) Siitaa.⁴ He founded two villages in *pargana* Vihiir and named both *Ahaaloor* [Jaloor].⁵ Then he died.

Raaja **Shachiinar**, his son, took his place. He founded a village Shanaara in *pargana* Vihii and died.⁶

His nephew Raaja **Ashook**, the son of Shakuun⁷ became the ruler after him. He built the villages *Takleet* and *Tabuut* [Shushkaleetra and Vitastaatra].⁸ The fort Sheer too is among of the buildings constructed by him.⁹ Since, he had no son there was disturbance in the realm, and many counties were laid waste.¹⁰

1. End of the digitalized manuscript ... image 15.

2. RTK, I: 97

3. A canal called *Swnu'ma'ny*, (the golden stream) approximating to the king's name Suvarna (gold) still flows in present-day Kulgaam district, by a village called Aaddijan and irrigates a large area. Aaddijan is a couple of miles from Gudar and A'sthyal villages.

4. While Persian writers take great care to give full reverence for the Muslim prophet, his relations and Muslim saints, they are dismissively irreverent towards the personages revered by Hindus.

5. The Persian translator is incorrectly translating RTK, I: 98, which says he established a *vihaara* and an *agrahaara* called Jaloor.

6. RTK says he died without a male issue (I: 100).

7. Grand-son of Shakun (I: 101).

8. These are the distortions of Shushkaleetra and Vitastaatra attributed to him by Kalhana (I: 102). These have been identified by Stein as Hokhalitr and Vyathavotur (Stein, Vol. I, fn to *shlooka* 102). Vyathu'votur, is the fabled origin of Vyath (Vistasta), near Veeriinaag village.

9. It is the distortion of the name Srinagar, which Kalhana attributes to this king (I: 104).

10. This is a distortion of the original, which says that since the country was over-run by *mleechhas*, the king obtained from worshiping Shiva, a son

Later a person, named Raaja **Jalook**, came to rule. He removed the corrupt. Under his rule, Kashmir was illuminated again. The gang of *mleechhas*, who were opposed to his religion, gathered and attacked him. Jalook prevailed and vanquished the opponents. He, then, set out to conquer Hindustaan and captured lands upto Kanooj. He brought traders¹ and others from Kanooj and settled them in Kashmir².

He grouped his officers into seven departments and delineated the duties of each: the first was to look after the affairs of justice, the second treasury, the third defense, ammunition and war effort, the fourth the command of army, the fifth for counsel and consultation, the sixth for the classification of lands and revenue and the seventh for arraigning the sepoys³ so that they reach quickly when needed.⁴

With these reforms he enforced such a system of administration and justice that people forgot the legends of Raaja *Jadashtar* [Yud-dhishttar] of the Paanddava clan, described in detail in the translation of *Mahaabhaarat*.⁵ His queen, named *Ishaanii*, too was an epitome of benevolence and bestowed much wealth on the destitute, and dedicated the village *daavaaranj/*

named Jalooka, who throw them out (RTK, I: 107-8).

1. The original says '...people of all the four castes...' (RTK, I: 117).
2. End of the digitalized manuscript ... image 16.
3. This is a very inaccurate translation of what the original says. *Shlooka* I: 119 actually says that there had been only seven state-offices so far. *Shlooka* I: 120 says that the king established eighteen offices, as had been set up by Yudhishtthira.
4. The seven offices described here are also incorrect, not being the ones given in the original text of Kalhana. The seven existing state offices, given by Kalhana are: the judge, the revenue superintendent, the treasurer, the commander of the army, the envoy, the *Purohita* and the astrologer (RTK, I: 119). Persian chronicles (THMC, Persian text, page 7; VK, Persian text, page 12) reproduce this incorrect passage of ITK.
5. This is not in the original. It is a misreading of RTK I: 120, which refers to the 18 offices having been set up by Yudhishtthira.

davaarbah [Vaarabala] along with some other villages for the poor and needy.¹

It is said that one day the king was on his way somewhere, when a haggard and reedy woman came across him and said, "I am hungry. Give me something to eat."

Raaja said, "Ask for any food you fancy that I may give it to you." When the woman heard this, she suddenly transformed into a giantess and said, "As you have promised, fetch me human flesh".²

Raaja, who did not allow any living being to be harmed, replied, "I do not permit injury to any animal. Come eat my flesh and satisfy yourself." Saying this Raaja presented himself to her.²

The woman opened her mouth to take a mouthful. The king offered himself with full consent and courtesy. When she saw the nobility of the king and the verity of his promise, she said, "You are perfectly noble. The group called Buddhists had sent me to test you. Now I have put you to trial and am satisfied. So long as you live, be good and steadfast in your deeds."³

Thereafter the king built many places of worship as are found in the religion of Hindus and spent a lot of money for the mendicants.⁴ Day and night he attended to the complaints of the people and busied himself in prayers, till he passed away.⁵

1. The original (RTK, I: 121) speaks of the king establishing the *agrahaara* of Vaarabala, which Stein identifies with village Baaraval (fn, I: 121). The queen is said to have placed *maatrachakras* at the gates of Kashmir (I: 122). The Persian translator seems to have confused the *shlookas*.
2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 17
3. This is a dilatory and variant version of the original story of king's encounter with *Kritya* (RTK, I: 131-46).
4. The original says that he built *Krityaashrama*, a Buddhist *vihaara*, at the site of the encounter with *Kritya* (I: 147).
5. The Persian translation omits Kalhan's report of his building Buddhist monasteries.

After him, a person of the Raaja Ashooka's clan, named Raaja **Damoodar II** sat on the throne. He was very pious. He was a friend of Kubeer, who Hindus say was the elder brother of Raavana.

One day the king had arranged for a feast for his dead father. The king set out to take a bath in the river *Bahat*¹ [Vyath]. Suddenly two Brahmans came to him and asked for food. He said, "I cannot give you anything until I have bathed in Vyath."

They said to him, "We shall bring the river Vyath to you." The king looked around and saw the river flowing by. He said, "You have revealed the river to me by magic, else Vyath is far away from this place; go away. I'll not give you anything until I have bathed in Vyath."²

Hearing the king speak so, they said, "Since you do not give us anything, we ask the *Lord of All* to turn you into a snake."

When the king heard this curse, he fell down at the feet of the two elders and beseeched them to forgive his sin. They said, "Our curse cannot be repudiated. However, you would return to human form if there be a person who can, in a single day, recite to you the whole of Raamaayan, which is an established scripture of Hindus and was translated (into Persian) on the orders of Akbar Shah.³ Till now, none as could recite whole Raamaayan to him, in a single day, has become available. Near Kashmir⁴ there is a place called Daamoodar Vuddar, where that snake still lives and betimes people can see him. Lord knows the Truth!

1. All Persian writers give this erroneous name to the well-known river of Kashmir called Vyath (Vitasta), even to this day. Shamsudiin Ahmad, the Urdu translator of *vaakaati kashmiir*, claims that 'Bahat' of the Persian chronicles is the original name which Hindus have distorted to 'vitasta' (*vaakaati kashmiir*, Urdu tr., page)

2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 18

3. Five titles of Akbar here, extending to a full line, have been omitted. Badaayyunii speaks of this translation in his *Mantakhabul Tavaariikh* too, and curses himself for having written a work of *kaafirs* (Urdu tr. ICPUL, New Delhi., Vol II, page 312).

4. i.e. the capital city, Srinagar

Thereafter, three brothers occupied the throne jointly. Named Raaja **Hushak**, the second **Zushak** and the third **Kunshak**, each one of the brothers founded a city known after his own name and lived there. Hushak founded the Vushkar city, Zushak founded Jahampoor and Kunshak founded Kaanaspoor. The three cities exist as three small villages now.¹

The three brothers belonged to the sect called Buddhists. They ruled with care and kindness and passed away.²

Raaja *Aba Makun* [**Abhimanyu**]³ became the ruler after them. He founded the town Aba Poor [Abhimanyupura]⁴ in pargana Baangil. A Brahman called Chandra [Chandraacharya] lived in his rule. He wrote many books.⁵

After him Raaja *Gupaanand* [**Gonanda III**]⁶ attained to the rule of the realm.⁷ He was very kind. People were highly prosperous and received much beneficence during his reign. Because of his good qualities and justice, many of his family attained to the rule. He ruled for thirty-five years and passed away.⁸

1. The villages are identified as the present day, Ushkar and Kaanaspur in Varu'mul and Zokur in Srinagar (Stein, Vol I, page 30., fn, I: 168).

2. Kalhana says they ruled 150 years after Buddha (I: 172) and that Naagarjuna then lived at Shaddarhadvana (I: 173).

3. RTK, I: 174

4. RTK, I: 175

5. The Persian translator has confounded the original report which says that Chandraacharya and others introduced the study of *mahaabhaashya* into Kashmir and wrote grammar (RTK, I: 176).

6. RTK, I: 185

7. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 19

8. This line could be put as 'He died after ruling for 35 years', without any change in the meaning. However, this translation reproduces the Persian Translation as closely as possible and says exactly what the Persian Text says, in the same words.

His son, Raaja **Indarjiit**¹ succeeded to the kingship, after his father. He passed away after a reign of thirty-six years.

Raaja **Raavan**, the son, succeeded his father. He made many conquests in Hindustaan and died after a reign of thirty years.

His son, Raaja *Pahiikahan*, [**Vibhiishana II**]² came to rule after him. He was well-versed in music and spent much time in listening to the music and singing. He is also called Kinanar. His reign lasted thirty-five years.

Raaja **Nar**, his son, succeeded him. He unleashed many tyrannies. It is said that one of the group called Buddhists was a master magician, so much so that he could see all but none could see him. With this magical prowess, he would enter people's houses and violate their women.³ When the king heard of it, and many people also petitioned him, he ordered all monasteries and their vihaaras (walls⁴) to be destroyed.

The king resided at Chakdar town, which is now included among royal tributaries. The historians of Kashmir, writing of his era, report that during the reign of Raaja Nar, a Brahman⁵ called *Basaak* [*Vishaakha*]⁶ happened to go to the bank of a pond. There, he heard the jingle of anklets. Rightfully curious, he looked around and saw two damsels of unimaginable beauty, clad in heavenly garments, eating the soiled fruit, fallen from the trees.⁷ *Vishaakha* was astounded at this and said to himself, "Why do

-
1. *Sh.*, I: 192 has been omitted which says Vibhiishana I was the son of Gonanda III and succeeding him ruled for '60 years less by 6 years and 6 months'. Indarjiit was Vibhiishana's son.
 2. RTK, I: 196.
 3. Stein's translation says that the Buddhist *shramana*, living in a vihaara, seduced the [king's] wife through magic power (RTK, I: 199).
 4. The text (image 20) says *diivaarhaa* (walls); could be distortion of *vihaara* (*vihaars*).
 5. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 20
 6. RTK, I: 204.
 7. The original says they ate 'the pods of *kacchaguccha* [grass]' not fruits (RTK, I: 221).

these dainty beauties eat the groveller fruit which is the food of beggars?" So he gave them a portion of the good food and fruit he carried with him. They ate it. He then asked, "Whose daughters you are? How have you come here? And, why do you eat these soiled fruit, which is unworthy of you?"

The elder one of the two damsels replied, "We are the daughters of *naaga* Sasrava. I am Iiraavatii and this is my sister Chandraleekhaa. Since you ask of our coming and eating, on such and such day our father shall come to the spring of Javana¹, which is near the saffron fields, and we shall be accompanying him. Ask him about our straits. He may tell you. The mark of identification of our father is that each hair of his head drips with water." Saying so, the two vanished from the Brahman's sight. The Brahman was puzzled. He waited for the appointed day. When the day arrived, he went there.² He saw many people gathered there and also the father of the damsels, with the signs he sought. He found the two daughters standing by him.

The Brahman said to him, 'I recognize you. Tell me the truth of why your daughters eat the fallen down fruit'.

He said, "If I tell you my story and that of my daughters, you'll gain nothing but grief there from. You cannot help us. So why should I tell you my tale?"

The Brahman beseeched him much to tell him his tale saying that he may be able to help them. Thereupon, the *naaga* (serpent) attained the human form and said, "Behold the man sitting beneath that tree. He is the rightful watchman and keeps watch over all the crops and fruits with the spells he has mastered. Due to this prowess, we cannot eat anything without his permission.

1. The original actually says Takshaka [Naaga] not Javana (I: 220). It, however, has been identified as Jayavana or Zevan, famous for its ancient shrine. Cultivation of saffron is said to have originated from Takshaka Naaga (fn. Stein, Vol I, page 36).

2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 21

If you can deflect his attention for a moment from his magic, we shall eat off the crop and fruit. After you do this, I'll marry you to whichever of these daughters of mine you fancy."

The Brahman asked, "How can he be deflected from his magic spells?"

He said, "Of the every new crop, he first gives to the mendicants, the beggars and the poor and then eats it himself. If you do something so that he himself eats of the new ripened grain or fruits, then he would be deflected from his spells."¹

Brahman Vishaakha got himself employed with the person, who was called Siispaal. A long time passed. Beguiling him one day, he cooked the newly ripened grain and took it to him. Unaware, he ate.² It is said that on that very day the *naaga* brought down huge rain and took away the crops of the realm. Though Siispaal tried many spells, it didn't work.

Then Vishaakha went to the spot where he had first seen those damsels. He saw the person there. He took the Brahman to his own city and said, "I'll bestow on you whichever of the daughters you want." He selected Chandraleekha, who was the younger one. Her father married her to the Brahman. For a long time, he stayed there. Then he sought permission of his wife's father and returned to his own city with his wife. His father-in-law gave him countless goods, riches and jewels. The Brahman became the richest person in his city.

One day they had put some grains to dry in the sun, near his house. A horse chanced to come there and ate the grain. Chandraleekha came out, struck that horse with her hand and shooed it away from the grain. A golden imprint had formed

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 22

2. The original does not give the guard's name, or speak of the Brahman getting himself employed and cooking his food. It says Vishaakha 'secretly dropped fresh corn into the guard's dish' (RTK, I: 238).

where her hand had struck the horse. The owner was surprised to see it, and took it to Raaja Nar. The king had heard a little of the affairs of the Brahman and the charms of his wife. When he saw the mark¹ on that horse he became curious as to the hand that had left the mark.

After much investigation it was revealed that it was the mark of the hand of Vishaakha's wife. The king sent his men to Vishaakha and said, "Give me that woman; I'll grant you whatever you wish." The Brahman said, "Even if you bestow your whole kingdom to me, I'll not give my wife to you." The king ordered that the woman be forcibly brought from Vishaakha's house. His men went and surrounded Vishaakha house.

Taking his wife by hand, Vishaakha fled through a secret exit and went to the pond by whose bank he had first seen the two women. He saw his father-in-law there and told him of the king's tyranny.

The *naaga* was enraged, assumed his true form and charged upon the city, with such fierce fury that a fiery wind with thunder and lightning blew and burnt down all the people there along with the king and his family. So many people got killed because the wicked king that their blood and fat flowed out forming rivulets. The king had ruled for forty years less by three months.²

Raaja **Sidha**, his son, took the father's place. He had been saved from the havoc as his nurse had taken him to Bijbihaara before the event. After this happened, people from all around gathered, took him from the house of his nurse and appointed him their ruler. He ruled with kindness and justice³ and assuaged all the evil excesses his father had committed. Every ill that existed in the realm of Kashmir was removed. He rehabilitated all and was

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image _23
2. 'Forty-one years less by three months' RTK, I: 273.
3. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image _24

very benevolent. He ruled for sixty years, vanished from amongst the people and passed away.

His son, called Raaja *Udatbalaas*, [**Utpalaaksha**]¹ became the ruler after him. He ruled for thirty years and a half with justice and care, and passed away.

His son Raaja *Harnaaj* [**Hiranyaaksha**]² then took his father's place. He was kind like his father and just like his grandfather. He founded the village Haranpuur, which is now known as Raa'nyal, and is one of the famous places in Kashmir. He ruled for thirty-eight years and eight months and passed away.³

Raaja **Hiranyakul**, his son, took his father's place and passed away after ruling for sixty years with justice and care.

Raaja *Bashakal* [**Vasukul**]⁴ his son, took his father's place. He too ruled for sixty years and passed away.

His son, **Mihirkul**, then attained to the kingship. He was very brave, ferocious and wrathful. He killed people on the slightest pretext. Not a single day passed without his slaying a horde of people. In fact, pity had not entered his heart. He would not pity even the women, children, old and the weak, whose killing every reason and sanity abhors.

One day the wife of the king wore a cloth brought from *Sangahaldiip* [Simhala]⁵, which bore the imprint of the foot of the king of that realm.⁶ When Raaja Mihirkul saw that robe, he was so enraged that he swore not to do anything till he had brought Simhala under. Gearing up on that very day, he gathered a huge

1. Lotus-eyed (RTK, I: 286).

2. Deer-eyed (RTK, I: 287).

3. 'thirty-seven years and seven months' (RTK, I: 287)

4. RTK, I: 288

5. RTK, I: 294

6. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image _25

army and set out to conquer Simhala. Every county that lay in the route was vanquished with the force of sword. Those who could not confront him submitted to him. Raaja Mihirkul collected a large number of elephants, horses and kine on that campaign.

On reaching the sea-shore, he got boats and boarding them with his men, set out to conquer Simhala. He fought the king, prevailed over him and killed him along with a large number of people. Putting another person in his place, he returned. He subjected every county on the way to great tyranny and oppression and destroyed most of them, gathering countless wealth and goods.

When he reached the outcrop, now known as Hastiivanj, an elephant lost its balance and fell down the ridge uttering a mortal cry. The king was pleased with that elephant-fall. He ordered as many as a hundred elephants thrown down from that ridge and made much merry. The place has come to be known as Hastiivanj, since that day, as '*hastii*' is Hindi for elephant and '*vanj*' means 'going'. Other tyrannies of his are of the same nature, and need not be written about.¹

In consequence to his tyrannies, he contacted a fatal infirmity. Much as the physicians tried, there was little relief, and the king grew sick of his life. He got a huge fire lighted and burnt himself in it. His reign lasted seventy years.

Then his son, Raaja *Sikka* [*Baka*],² took the father's place at the head of the kingdom. He treated the subjects with care and consideration and alleviated the atrocities of his father with good deeds. During his reign there arose a sorceress and killed the king together with all his sons through magic spells. None survived, save a son of the king, who then was in the womb of his mother and was born later. The reign of the king was sixty-three years.

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image _26

2. RTK, I: 325

Raaja *Kitanand* [**Kshitinand**]¹ his son, sat on the throne after him with the acquiescence of the ministers of his father. He passed away after ruling for thirty years.

Then, Raaja **Vasunand** took the place of his father. He was very wise and respected the men of wisdom. He ruled for fifty-two² years and died. His son named Raaja Nar, sat on his father's throne. He ruled for sixty years and died.

Then, his son named Raaja Aj [**Aksha**]³, took his father's place. Like his father he too ruled for sixty years and died. Then his son, Raaja *Gopaanand*, [**Gopaaditya**]⁴ took the place of his father. He was very kind and built many temples. Amongst those is the grand temple standing on the hill which is now being called Takhti Sulaimaan. The temple still retains the grandeur of yore.⁵ He too ruled for sixty years and six days with justice and compassion and passed away. His son, Raaja **Gokarna**, then became the ruler. He ruled for fifty-eight years and died.

His son Raaja *Nareendra* [**Nareendraaditya**]⁶ took his father's place and ruled for thirty-eight years and died.

Then his son, Raaja *Andahjadashtar* [**Yuddhishttra I**] became the king in his father's stead. Since he was blind, he is called *andah*.⁷ Initially, he ruled for a long time with justice and fairness. Then he took to cruelty. He spent all his time in drinking and forcibly abducted people's wives. He withdrew from the proximity of able men and kept the company of the disreputable, the riotous and the wicked giving way to manifold corruption and perversity.

1. RTK, I: 326

2. 'fifty-two years and two months' (RTK, I: 337)

3. RTK, I: 338

4. RTK, I: 339

5. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 27](#)

6. RTK, I: 347

7. RTK (I: 350) says his eyes were small, slit-like, which was the reason of his being called '*andah*'.

When the evil and oppression unleashed by him became too much, the army and the subjects turned against him and the surrounding rulers from Tibet and Hind rushed in to occupy his realm. When the officers of his government observed know of this state of affairs, they all decided to select another ruler in his place. When this intelligence reached Andah Jadashtar, he took two or three of his intimates and left for Hindustaan.¹ On the way, one of the Raaja's recognized him and imprisoned him.² He passed away in that indigent state.³

From Raaja Gonand, the Third, to *Andah Jadashtar* [Yuddhishttra I], twenty-one kings ruled for the period of one thousand forty years, nine months and nine days.⁴

-
1. The original does not say so. Kalhana says that he was forced to leave (I: 366-67). He, however, adds that he left with his family, attendants and wealth too, though much of it was robbed on the way (I: 368-72).
 2. Again, this is contrary to the original. Kalhana says that the princes where the king took refuge made great efforts to alleviate his loss and fulfill his desires (RTK, I: 373).
 3. Kalhana later adds that 'some have reported ... he was, after some time, put in captivity by his own ministers at Durgaagalikaa (RTK, II: 4). Apparently, the Persian translator has misunderstood either this or his being robbed on the way.
 4. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image _28

RAAJATARANGINII

Of Kalhana

Book II

When Yuddhishttra I left the realm of Kashmir, the people of Kashmir with mutual consent brought one of the scions of Raaja Bakarmajiit [Vikramaaditya], the famous king of Maalva, called Partaabaadat [Prataapaaditya]¹, from Hindustan and put him on the throne. Thus the rule went out of the dynasty of Raaja Goonand.

Raaja **Prataapaaditya**, then, succeeded to the rule of the realm. When he became the king, he treated the army and the subject very well and rehabilitated the kingdom of Kashmir. He ruled for thirty-two years and passed away.

His son, Raaja **Jalook**, succeeded him and followed the example of his father in justice and benevolence. His reign was twenty-two years.²

Raaja *Tunjar* [**Tunjina**]³, his son, succeeded him. He had a wife called Vaakpushtaa. The king treated Brahmans, the sepoys and the subjects so well that a better modus could not be possible.

1. RTK, II: 5.

2. Kalhana says he ruled "for the same length of time as his father" (RTK, II: 10).

3. RTK, II: 11

During his reign, when the crops were readying to ripen, a heavy, out of season, snow fell unleashing the winter. Agriculture was totally devastated. As a result, a severe famine ensued in the land. The situation worsened to the extent that men took to eating men. If eatables came to somebody's hand, the son would not give it to his father, not the father to the son, nor the mother to the son. If somebody produced anything eatable, huge bodies of people attacked and killed them.¹

Raaja Tunjina was overwhelmed by grief and misery at these travails of the people. Whatever of the grains, raw or ripened, was in his treasury, he bestowed it upon the people, by and by. When nothing of it remained, he gave away his wealth and goods. With the king's bounties, the people could purchase a little grain for a lot of money and sustain themselves till all that was spent. When all was given away and the king had nothing, he said to his wife:

"This great calamity has befallen the people, during my reign. They would say that people suffered due to the evil deeds and destiny of the king and that this misfortune descended upon the public during the reign of that king. Whatever came to my hand, I spent it for the people without faltering, till nothing has remained with my government to aid them. Now the people would die because of this disaster. I cannot witness it. Due to ill-luck of people, it has snowed heavily. They have been so engulfed that they cannot escape it. Much though I consult the wise and the knowing ones no one has a solution to overcome it. I have decided to burn myself in a fire as I cannot stand the suffering of the people."

Saying so, the king grieved much. His wife said: "This is not the time to kill yourself. You should take heart and find ways to mitigate the suffering of people.² Bow to the just and omniscient Lord and pray in humility that he may pity the people."

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 29](#)

2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 30](#)

Thus the king and his wife raised their hands in prayer before the *All-Aiding* Lord and expressed their wish. The whole night, they spent in prayer and supplication. When the day dawned, they saw a pair of pigeons fall before every person. People ate the pigeons. Every day, this pair of pigeons reached each person. The Lord, in deference to the troth of that Raaja, opened the doors of provision to the people. And the king, who wanted to burn himself, refrained from that act. Every day, the provisions for the people increased. When the time to reap came, there was a great harvest and much grain was produced. People were freed of the misery and want.

The king had no issue. He ruled for thirty-six years and passed away. The people chose a person, named Raaja *Rijaayii* [Vijaya]¹ from the scions of that realm to rule after him. He ruled for eight years and died.

A person named Raaja **Jayeendra**, who was his son, then took his place.² He had a minister, called Sandmat [Sandhimati]³, who was incharge of all affairs. His enemies so scandalized him before the king that the king confiscated all his possession, properties and goods.⁴ For ten years he kept him in prison. Then the king was told that people are speaking of Sandhimati becoming the king. Enraged, the king ordered that he be slain. Thereafter, a great distress befell the king and a fatal apprehension took hold of him. Some days later he passed away in that distress. His reign lasted thirty-seven years. He, too, had no son.

Though reason is reluctant to be persuaded by the wondrous, improbable tales of the minister Sandhimati written by the historians of Kashmir, they are being reproduced here as a matter of duty.

-
1. RTK, II: 62.
 2. This strange expression is in the original!
 3. RTK, II: 65.
 4. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image _31

It has been recorded that after Raaja Jayeendra had slain Sandhimati, who had been the disciple of a Brahman named Ishaan Raina¹, the Brahman came to the place of his execution so that he could burn his body. He saw that beasts had eaten away most of the flesh of his body and only the bones remained. The Brahman brought the bony cage down from the wooden frame. He chanced to glance at the lines of his forehead. There, he saw it written that this person would suffer privations, would be imprisoned for ten years, then taken to the hang-post and killed and then he would attain to kingship of the realm.

The Brahman was amazed at this writ of fate. He said to himself: "All that has been written here has come true,² except attaining to kingship. How can it come about, especially since the person has been dead for long and the beasts have eaten away the flesh of his body? How can he attain to a kingship?" Thereupon, the Brahman did not burn his bones. He kept watch there saying to himself, "The Omnipotent Lord can enliven dead. There are legends in all religions and I hope that the true Lord shall bring him to life, miraculously."

So he kept the bones of the minister in his sight till, one night when it was pitch dark, there suddenly appeared light and illumined the whole area. Then, a pleasant fragrance spread and scented the space. A group, called *Joogiis* in Hindi, came there. One of them gathered the bones of the minister. All the *Joogiis* extended their hands and, one by one, his organs were restored. A *Yooginii*, who was the oldest of all, lifted her hands in prayer, beseeching the Lord to enliven that dead person. A moment later, the corpse moved and gradually life got infused into the whole body. He came alive and stood up.

The Brahman seeing it all got perturbed. Drawing his sword, he ran to the *Yooginiis*. Suddenly, the whole group vanished, and he heard their voice³: "This person shall be a great king; why do

1. The original does not have 'Raina' saying only Ishaana (RTK, II: 82).

2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 32](#)

3. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 33](#)

you draw your sword at us? Nobody can deprive him of the life bestowed upon him. He is now Raaja Aarya."¹

When the minister, who had come alive, saw his preceptor he fell at his feet. The Brahman embraced him. Both were happy at seeing each other. When the day dawned, the Brahman told all the people of his coming to life and what he had heard of his becoming the king.² Hearing this, all the people gathered to see him. They recognized him as having the same face and features that he had earlier had.³

Accordingly, they opportuned him, "Since, the king of this realm has passed away and has no son or capable heir, you should accept the kingship." He did not acquice and said, "I am devoted to my preceptor." So the people requested his preceptor to ask him to accept the kingship. The Brahman said to him: "Since, all the people opportune you, please accept it for my sake."⁴

On his teacher's bidding he agreed to rule and the people happily carried him to the throne. There was singing in each house, and drums, pipes, and conches were sounded.⁵ All the officers and ministers gave him the ritual bath and putting the crown of kingship on his head, led him to rule the kingdom. This tale though too strange a happenstance yet quite within the prowess of the creator, has been rendered as it appears in the records. The truth is known to the Lord alone!

1. 'He who was joined to a heavenly body, will be known by the name of Samdhimat and on account of noble character as Aaryaraaja' (RTK, II: 110).
2. The original does not say this. It instead says that the people somehow learned of it and came to request him to be the king. (RTK, II: 113-14).
3. The original says his appearance was different from the former one (RTK, II: 115).
4. This dialogue is not in the original (RTK, II: 116). The Persian translator, taking after the Persian writers, tells the history as a 'daliil' - tale - interpolating it with dialogue, attributions etc., even twisting the narrative to suit that form.
5. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 34

The said Raaja **Aarya** then ruled the kingdom making justice and care the foundation of his government. He was ever busy in worship, as if he had learned from the experiences that the life spent without prayer and submission to the Almighty breeds troubles and travails. People were happy and prosperous during his reign.¹

Since he was not ready to head the kingdom from the beginning being devoted to worship, he spent most of his time in prayer, neglecting the affairs of the state. People got disenchanted with him. He too saw that the people are not happy with his scanty interactions with them and devotion to prayers. Calling the ministers he said, "Till this day, I have headed the kingdom on your request. I am unhappy with this majesty and people are tired of my behavior. I abdicate this rule. Put who so ever you deem fit, at the head of this rule." He put on a deer-skin and went away.² Nothing is known of him since.³ He ruled for fifty-seven⁴ years.⁵

The length of the reigns of these six kings, the first Raaja Prataabaadat and the last Raaja Aarya, was one hundred and ninety-two years. When Aarya abdicated, a scion of the aforementioned Raaja Andah Jadashtar, named Meegavaahana, was appointed ruler.

1. Kalhana tells of his erecting Shiva lingas all over the land, including a whole hill carved into a thousand lingas, constructing Shiva shrine named Isheeshvara (Ishabroor) after his guru and giving splendor to Theeddaa, Bhiimadeevii, Vijeeshvara etc. (RTK, II: 125-41).
2. The original says he left dressed in spotless clothes (RTK, II: 161).
3. This is not what the original says. Kalhana describes both his journey to the Shiva shrine of Bhuutteeshvara (II: 162-69) and his living there among the *muniis*, till the end of his life (II: 170-171). The later chroniclers, using this translation as the basis, have repeated this incorrect assertion of ITK that 'nothing is known of him since'. GMD Suufii, with the later Persian chronicles as source, repeats this assertion and confounding the translator's mistake, goes on to liken Samdhimat to Jesus (*Kashiir*, Vol. I, page 40-41).
4. The translator is mistaken. The original says 'fifty years less three' i.e. 47 years (RTK, II: 142).
5. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 35](#)

RAAJATARANGINI

Of Kalhana

Book III

Then, Raaja **Meegavaahana** became the king. His lineage reached to Raaja Andah Jadashtar, who had been deposed from kingship. Appointed to the reign, he ruled with justice and care. He did not let any living being to be harmed, and ordered that no animal should be slaughtered. For sustenance of hunters and the butchers, who derived their livelihood from killing of animals, he fixed stipends. He founded many villages and towns. To enquire of the straits of the people, he roamed the city at night in disguised robes so that none would recognize him.¹ He gave money and clothes to the destitute and the mendicants. If anyone were abused, he would provide quick redress.²

After establishing a stable rule, he led a campaign towards Hindustaan. Rulers of all the counties, which he came across, accepted his suzerainty. He did them no harm. If they fought he overcame them and rendered the inhabitants thereof prosperous. In this way he conquered many counties, and reached the sea

1. This habit of roaming the realm in disguise at night, so characteristic of West Asian kings, is not mentioned in the original account (RTK, III: 2-15).

2. This line sums up *shlookas* RTK, III: 16-26

shore.¹ Then he sailed out to conquer the islands. First he set his sights on Lanka and reached the mountain standing on Lanka. Crossing over to it he took station under a huge tree with his army.

It is said Bahiikan [Vibhiishana]², the brother of ten-headed Raavana whose tale is described in full in the aforementioned translation, who was the ruler of Lanka sent somebody to enquire as to this person who had landed there. On learning that it was Raaja Meegavaahana, he came with many presents of Lanka to see the king. The Raaja said to him, "If you wish to befriend me, instruct your officers not to eat meat till I live." Historians record that Vibhiishana accepted all that he bade. Offering him much tribute, he left. Thereafter, Raaja went to many islands and conquered them. Finally, he returned to Kashmir, his kingdom. He ruled for thirty-four years with care and justice and passed away.

His son, Raaja *Sharmab Seen* [Shreeshttha Seena]³, then occupied the father's place. He ruled the county, which his father had held, with rectitude and honour. He ruled for thirty years and passed away. He left two sons – one was named Haran [Hiranya]⁴ and the other *Tuurmaan*. Raaja **Hiranya** occupied the throne after him, and *Tuurmaan* became the minister.⁵ For a long time, they ruled with unity and amity.

After some time, *Tuurmaan*⁶ ordered money to be minted in own his name. When *Hiranya* heard of it he was enraged. He arrested *Tuurmaan* and imprisoned him.

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 36
2. RTK, III: 73. The translation is a much warbled account of what Kalhana has written.
3. RTK, III: 97. He was also called *Pravarseena*, which name his grandson adopted. He is called *Pravarseena I* while the latter is *Pravarseena II*.
4. RTK, III: 102
5. The original says *yuvaraaja* i.e. heir (RTK, III: 102).
6. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 37

Tuurmaan's wife, called Anjanaa, descended of Raaja Achhaak [Ikshvaaku]¹, fled and hid in the house of a potter. There, she gave birth to a son. He was named Pravarseen.² The wife of that potter brought up the child. When he grew up, all took him to be the son of the potter. He, however, did not incline to take up the potter's trade. Instead, he would take a bow and arrow and busy himself in archery and hunting. Among the children he played with, his face evinced clear signs of nobility and rank.

Every day he gathered the children and they, in child-play, appointed him to kingship. He bestowed an office of the state upon each of those children. Every day, the youngsters behaved like servants before him. all through, the appointees kept the same offices he had granted to them. One day Anjana's brother, named Jayeendra, who had heard of the straits of his sister and brother-in-law came to Kashmir to enquire (of her affairs), *incognito* so that none would recognize him. When he reached the city he saw a boy of 12-years sitting in style, exuding grandeur, and other children standing in attendance. Whatever he said, they carried out.³

Seeing him, Jayeendra felt a natural surge of affection for him suffusing his head. He couldn't move away and stood rooted there, looking at him. As night fell, the children went to their homes. Jayeendra followed his nephew to the potter's house. Anjana had herself come out of the house for her son. Her brother recognized her, and coming forth embraced her. Meeting thus, they wept tears of joy. The boy asked his nurse as to this person, who had come across his mother and wept. She told him that he was his mother's brother and related to Parvarseen the affairs of his father and his imprisonment.

Around that time, Raaja Hiranya chanced to release his brother from the prison on some people's intercession and regard,

1. '...daughter of Vajreendra of Ikshvaaku's race...' (RTK, III: 105).

2. At the bidding of his mother, the potter's wife called him, who was a grandson of Pravarseena, by the very name of his grandfather (RTK, III: 109).

3. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 38

and showered his affection upon him. His son, wife and wife's brother met Tuurmaan. After a short while, Tuurmaan took ill and died. His wife wanted to burn herself with him but her son and brother beseeched her and watched over her. Her son went with his uncle to Hindustaan for the pilgrimage of the sacred shrines. Rest of his affairs shall be related at their own place.

Raaja Hiranya ruled for thirty years and two months and passed away. He had no son. Raaja Maatrigupt then sat on the throne.¹ It came about as follows. When Tuurmaan's son Parvarseen left for Hindustaan and his uncle Raaja Hiranya died, Raaja Vikramaaditya ruled over the whole Hindustaan. Ujain, in Maalva, was his capital. Since there was nobody worthy of kingship in Kashmir, the officers of the state went to Vikramaaditya to seek a ruler. The Raaja appointed a person to the kingship of that country (Kashmir).² He kept some of the officers with him and sending others back to Kashmir fixed *jaajiirs* for them.

Later, a Brahman called Maatragupt went from Kashmir and entered his service. Day and night he served him, till one day Raaja was so pleased with him that he decreed the kingship of Kashmir to him. He sealed the order and handed it to him, such that he was unaware of the contents thereof. He said to him, "O Brahman! I want you to deliver this decree of mine to the minister and ruler in Kashmir. Thereafter I shall fulfill whatever your wish be."

The Brahman, took the decree of the king with great dejection, and set out for Kashmir. He traversed the distance in misery and sorrow saying to himself, "None save myself would've returned hapless from Vikramaaditya.³ It must be this bad luck of mine that the king has sent me away; he is not to blame?" Reaching Kashmir, he resolved that after handing over the letter to the

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 39](#)

2. The original account does not speak of any person being put to rule in the interregnum; it says that Vikramaaditya settled on the name of Maatrigupta while he was considering the matter (RTK, III: 185-91).

3. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 40](#)

officers of Kashmir he'd go away as he felt ashamed of going to his family and friends empty-handed.¹

When he handed over the order and they went through its contents, they immediately stood back and reverencing him said, "The king has appointed you to rule over us and govern." The Brahmana was beside himself with joy. The elders put on him the robes of governance and bowed before him. Thus the kingship of Kashmir got bestowed upon Raaja **Maatrigupt**, as per the orders of Raaja Vikramaaditya.

On the very first day of rule he ordered that money and goods be brought up from the treasury. He first gave sumptuous gifts and much money to the officers and elders of the state and then bestowed goodies on other classes. Finally, he called the beggars and the destitute and gave robes and money to them all. Every person of his own, he established on a suitable post and made the rich and the laity happy. He gathered all the excellent things of Kashmir and sent them to Raaja Vikramaaditya.²

He treated the people and the sepoys with such equanimity and justice that all grew highly contented with his rule. He passed his days with ease and benevolence, till Raaja Vikramaaditya lived. There was no disturbance any where.

Then, out of blue, came the news that Parvarseen, who was the heir to the kingship, had rebelled,³ and had brought Nagarkoot

1. The translator has been confused. Kalhana attributes thoughts of despondency like these to people (RTK, III: 211-18) while Matrigupt himself went away cheerfully, certain that an award awaited him (RTK, III: 219-24).
2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 41
3. The word used in the text '*kharuu*' is a special term denoting the common pattern of rebellion that emerged in West and Central Asia during the Muslim ascendancy; those who did not accept the *khilaafat* dispensation quietly left the cities or lands guarded by their armies, gathered forces and then attacked the *khaliifa*. Derived from '*khaar*' or '*exit*', '*kharuu*' denotes the people who got exiled for their differences and then came back to attack (Taariikhi Islaam, *ibid.*). Parvarseen was already out of the realm having gone on pilgrimage with his maternal uncle during the rule of his uncle Haran (see *supra*).

and its surroundings under his control. Around this very time, there reached the word of Raaja Vikramaaditya's death. Maatrigupt said, "I do not wish to rule, even live, after Raaja Vikramaaditya." Abdicating the government, he donned a mendicants robe and left for Banaaras. When this news reached Parvarseen, who had established his control, he himself came before Maatrigupt and said, "Why do you abdicate the kingship? I do not intend to rule Kashmir and extern you. If you do not believe me, I swear by this and this, and I shall return this instant. You keep ruling Kashmir."

Maatrigupt said, "I do not wish to live after (the death of) Raaja Vikramaaditya, what to speak of the kingship! Let me go so that I become a mendicant and spend the rest of my life in prayer and submission."¹ Much though Parvarseen did insist,² the Brahman did not consent and left for Banaaras and busied himself in his chosen calling, till his death.³ His reign lasted four years and nine months.⁴

Raaja Parvarseen, the son of Tuurmaan, son of Sarshat Seen, son of Meegavaahan, became the king after Raaja Vikramaaditya died and Maatrigupt abdicated the government of Kashmir. As related earlier he had gone for the pilgrimage of the sacred shrines in Hindustaan, in company of his maternal uncle named Jayeendar, while his uncle Raaja Haran still lived. First, he bathed in the Ganga and then went to other places. Wherever he heard of the existence of a shrine, he went there, and also took part in the ceremonies there. Then, he went to the mountain called Shrii Parbat, in the Deccan county, and entered the service of the sage there. He served him with his heart, for some time.

1. The word in the text, '*taa-at*' - submission - is also a special term deriving from the Islamic concept holding that abject submission to Allah is the highest virtue for a person to cultivate.
2. The original says that Praverseena restrained his ministers from attacking Maatrigupt as he planned to 'destroy Vikramaaditya himself' (RTK, III: 218-82). The dialogue given by translator conforms to that in the original closely though it is not as elegant or as comprehensive (RTK, III: 281-98).
3. He lived for ten years more (RTK, III: 322).
4. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 42

The sage said, "Be happy. The Lord has ordained a great kingship for thee."

He said, "How'll I get a kingdom? I have none to support me, and no goods or riches for which people would gather around me. Even the kingship that my ancestors possessed has passed out of my family. I hear that my uncle has died and Raaja Vikramaaditya has bestowed our ancient kingdom upon a Brahman."

The sage replied, "What does it matter! A great kingdom stands writ for you. You would head many counties. I have prayed the Lord Almighty to bestow many lands on you. My prayers do not go unanswered."¹ Parvarseen grew joyous on receiving this news.²

Taking leave of the sage, he turned towards his own land. When he drew near the county of Kashmir, those who had been in the service of his uncle and father, hearing of his approach, came in hordes to join him and a huge army gathered around him. On the advice of his maternal uncle, he first turned to conquer Nagarkoott. He fought the king there, overcame him and captured the county. Then venturing out, he captured most of the counties of Punjaab. People from all sides joined him and a huge army was formed. He decided to attack Raaja Vikramaaditya and set out towards Ujain. Around this time, he got the news of the death of Raaja Vikramaaditya. The events that followed have been summarised above.

Raaja Parvarseen appointed his own officers in the counties of Punjab and other places he had conquered and himself returned to Kashmir, bringing the people justice, care and generosity. People of Kashmir were much delighted at his coming. The realm grew very prosperous under his rule.

-
1. The original account actually says that Pravarseen had been yearning for a kingdom for two incarnations and, asking for it pointedly now, was granted the prayer (RTK, III: 267-78).
 2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 43

Spending a couple of years or so in this establishment, he turned to conquests. Having conquered most counties of India, he turned towards Ujain, the capital of Raaja Vikramaaditya. At that time Raaja Vikramaaditya's son called Shilaaditya¹ had been overcome by his enemies. They had deprived him of his father's kingdom. Subdued, he had confined himself to a fort. Raaja Parvarseen fought his enemies, overcame them, slayed most of them and imprisoned a huge horde.² He sent for Raaja, the son of Vikramaaditya, and bestowed the whole realm of Ujain and Maalva upon him. Conquering more counties he returned to Kashmir in great glory.³

After staying there for a length of time, he thought of building a capital of his own. To this end he roamed the realm of Kashmir. No place met his quest, till on the beckoning of a *jin*⁴, which tale has been described in detail in the original work⁵ and recording it here would be little more than a formality, he went near Kohi Maaraan⁶ and there found a line drawn upon the earth to the

1. 'Prataapashila also called Shilaaditya' (RTK, III: 330).
2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 44](#)
3. Kalhana says he brought back the throne of his family, which had been carried away (III: 331).
4. The original work of Kalhana says Bhairava, which the translator has rendered as the Islamic construct '*jin*'. Bhairava, considered a personification of Lord Shiva, denotes a figure of great veneration in the Shaivist lore.
5. RTK, III: 336-49.
6. Persian historians invariably turn the local names into Persian equivalents to give the place a new name. A classical case, here, is turning the original name *Panchaal Deeva* into *Piir Panchal* (*Deeva* = *Piir*, grandee/ guide) as shown by Stein (RTK, Vol. I, Page...). How the well known Hari Parbat (*Parbat*, i.e. mountain of *Hari*, *Shaarika*, the goddess) became *Kohi Maaraan* (the hill of snakes) is difficult to see. Snakes as such are very rare in Kashmir and even now the holy hillock is not known for any abundance of the reptilian species. This designation may have come from a preponderance of Shiva *muurtiis* adorned by the customary *naagas* (serpents). Or, there may have existed a predominating edifice of *naaga* there. But there is no evidence of either on ground or in the collective memory of people. On the South-eastern face of the holy hill lies the ancient shrine of Pokhribal, over the sacred spring (*naaga*), there. Did the *naaga* (spring) translated into *naaga-sepent-maar* become

extent of four *kruh*.¹ The king summoned the masons and ordered them to build within that line. A grand city was founded. His officers, lords and other people came in great numbers and raised buildings there, creating a city with which few places in that time could compare. It is said that thirty-six lakh houses had been built there. It had been named Srinagar.² That is the city which still adorns Kashmir and is the seat of rulers. The river Vyath runs through it. Raaja Parvarseen ruled for sixty years with grandeur and glory and passed away.

His son Raaja Jadashtar [**Yudhishtthira**]³, then, attained to the kingship. For thirty-nine years and three months, he ruled with justice and care and passed away.

Then his son Raaja Lachman [**Lahkhana** alias **Nareendraaditya**]⁴ sat on the seat of governance and after ruling for three years⁵ passed away. His brother Raaja Zayaadat [**Ranaaditya**] then took his brother's place and ruled the realm.⁶ He was also called Tunjiina. He was very brave and fought many battles. He had a wife called Ranaarambha. She was very benevolent to the subjects and very pious.

Once, her father Raaja Ratiseena, the ruler of Deccan, had gone on a joy-sail upon the sea. Suddenly he saw a beautiful damsel upon the waves, who betimes went below and betimes rose upon

the basis of holy hill being turned into *Kohi Maaraan*, a snake-hill? Next to the *shilaa* shrine of Deevii, the most signal icon at Parbat is the huge *muurtii* of Bhiimasvaamii Ganeesha. Reduced to a broken mass now, the *muurtii* once towered over the city overlooking Srinagar and its inhabitants, as the protector deity.

1. Kruh or Koos ~ 2 miles; there is no mention of length in the original (RTK, III: 348).
2. A previous *shlooka*, which the translator has omitted there, said that Ashooka had given the capital he built, the name *Shriinagara* (RTK, I: 104).
3. RTK, III: 379
4. RTK, III: 383.
5. 'Thirteen years' (RTK, III: 385).
6. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 45

the waters. Raaja ordered the sailors to bring her in. He took her as his daughter and brought her up in his palace. When she grew up, kings from all over came to claim her hand in marriage but he did not bestow her upon any one. Later, Raaja Ranaaditya went to claim her in marriage. Raaja Ratiseena married the girl to Ranaaditya. They lived a long life, together.

Raaja Ranaaditya built hospitals for the treatment of the poor and the destitute. Food and medicines were provided to the patients. It is said that Raaja Ranaaditya lived for three hundred years. In this regard a long tale is recounted in the original, which if desired can be looked up there.¹ After his reign, the king along with the queen, retired to a cave and nothing more was known of them.

Raaja *Bikramaadat* [*Vikramaaditya*]² then attained to the kingdom of his father. He ruled for forty-two years with justice and care and died.

His brother, named Baalaadat, [*Baalaaditya*]³, then attained to the kingship. He set out to conquer India.⁴ He conquered many counties there and returned to Srinagar, the capital of Kashmir. He ruled for a period of thirty-six years⁵ and died.

These ten kings from Raaja Meegavaahana to Baalaaditya ruled for five hundred, fifty-three years and one day. Then the rule passed to another dynasty.⁶

1. RTK, III: 392-431

2. RTK, III: 474

3. RTK, III: 477

4. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 46](#)

5. 'thirty-seven years less four months' (RTK, III: 526).

6. Raajataranginii edited by M A Stein (Vol, I page 119, Sanskrit text, Vol III, page 43) does not carry this line. Stein says that the line, appearing in some manuscripts, is a later insertion (*ibid*, Vol I, page 119).

RAAJATARANGINII

Of Kalhana

Book IV

Raaja **Durlabvardhan**, who was the son-in-law of Raaja Baalaaditya, attained to the kingdom of his wife's father with the efforts of the king's minister, Kanak [Kankha].¹ Historians of Kashmir have written (many) tales in respect of his birth. Being contrary to the logic and mores, they have been left out. If desired, they can be looked up in the original work.²

When this king attained to the rule, he dealt with his subjects so well that they came to support him with heart and mind. He ruled for thirty-six years and died.

Raaja **Prataapaditya**, the grandson of Baalaaditya³ through his daughter, then sat on the throne of his grandfather. He founded the city Taapar towards Kamraaj, for his residence. The officers of the state built grand buildings there.⁴

1. RTK, III: 524
2. It is strange that the Persian translator should have found the very probable circumstance of an ordinary person attaining to the kingship contrary to reason and mores. The tales tell how the king angry with his daughter marries her off to the horse groom (RTK, III: 524).
3. The Persian text says Durlabavardhana, which is not correct. Prataapaditya was Durlabhavardhana's son and grandson of Baalaaditya (RTK, IV: 7-8).
4. Ruins of the grand temple have been excavated at village Taapar in 1960's by Archaeological Survey of India. The village forms the southern tip of the alluvial plain extending to Varu'mul.

It is said that at that time a merchant from South called Noon had come to Kashmir, and presented rare gifts to the king. The king liked his company and kept him in his service for a long time. One night the king held an assembly with his intimates and ordered that the merchant too be called. They spent the whole night together. The next day the king¹ again called him.² He said, "My head aches from the smoke of (oil) lamps lighting your assembly." The king wondered if light could be obtained by a source other than (oil) lamps at night.

A few days later, the merchant organized a feast at night and invited the king. When the king went to his house, he saw that instead of (oil) lamps, night-sparkling diamonds had been laid around which so illumined the room that it was little different from day-light. The king was wonderstruck. The merchant again presented the king curiosities, which none in the county had seen. He offered all his goods, maid servants and slaves to the king. Of them, the king was bewitched by a beautiful maid but did not express his desire there.³ He was so besotted with the love of that maid that he found no repose and took to bed of enfeeblement.

The merchant got wind of the king's bewitchment. He came unto the king and said, "A thousand lives of mine be sacrificed for a hair thine! I opportune you to tell whichever maid you desire, so that I shall bring her to your palace."

The king said, "It is not meet that I should take your woman; you who have been so kind to me!" How so hard the merchant pressed, the king did not consent. A few days later the ache of love so floundered the king that he was near death. The merchant saw the king would not accept his offer but continues to be lovelorn. He took that woman to a village assigned to Mahaadeeva and left

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 47

2. The original says 'the king asked him in the morning as to his being comfortable' (RTK, IV: 14).

3. The Persian text gives the impression of her being one of the women owned by the merchant, when the original clearly says she was the merchant's wife (RTK, IV: 17).

her there to serve. Then he said to the king.¹ "Now, she is not mine. Tell, so that they bring her from that village unto your house."

The king was highly embarrassed at his gallantry. He brought the woman to his house and was much enamored and enchanted with her. Four sons were born to him through that woman. He appointed the eldest, named Chandrapiid, his heir. After ruling for fifty years with great justice and care, he passed away.

Raaja **Chandrapiid** then became the king as per his father's will. He was very just, generous and benevolent to the people. During his rule people lived with prosperity and ease. Many tales of his justice have been recorded. One of these is² that one day a woman came unto the king and said that her husband had been slain and that until the murderer of her husband was not found she won't eat anything and would give up her life. The king asked, "Do you suspect anyone of having killed your husband."

The woman said, "My husband was of such a disposition that he did not harm anyone who I may suspect. However, there is a person who used to eat with my husband and after eating would talk somewhat harshly. I suspect him a little and none else at all."

The king ordered the person to be brought up and asked him about the affair. He vehemently denied. The king said, "Tell this person to dive in water and keep watch over him. If he has sinned, he'd die."

The woman said, "This person³ possesses a magical spell which would not let any harm be caused to him if he remains under water for ten days." The king said, "Heat oil to boiling

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 48
2. The first tale related by Kalhana, which the translator has omitted, is that of a tanner, whose hut stood at the site where the king had chosen to build his temple of Tribhuvanavasvamin. The tanner refused to give up his hut. The officers tried to eject him, but the king admonished them telling them to choose a different site (RTK, IV: 55-60). Then, he himself went to the tanner's house and requested him to give up that place. Thereupon the tanner agreed to give up the land (RTK, IV: 62-77).
3. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 49

point and put that person's hand in the oil, so that if he be sinful his hand'll burn."

The woman said, "Because of the magic, no harm comes to that person from heat."

Then king said, "O woman! In that case I am unable to redress this grievance. You yourself tell what ought to be done."

That woman remained in the king's house for three days and ate nothing. Following her, the king too didn't eat anything and became very weak in consequence. Then at night he dreamed that someone was saying to him, "Go to such and such village, founded by you.¹ Order that powdered rice be sprinkled around the village. Ask anyone suspected of having killed that Brahman to walk on the rice flour. If while walking impression of double feet are seen for anyone, arrest him, for he is the murderer of that poor being."

On the next morn, the king went to the said village. He took the suspect there, along with another one. He ordered that rice-flour be sprinkled around the village. When the night came he first ordered the other person to walk on it. No mark of double feet appeared. When the suspect walked on the flour, immediately the impression of double feet was seen. The king ordered him to be punished. He too admitted his guilt. Other like tales of his justice have been recorded.² He ruled for eight years and eight months and passed away.

Then his brother, Raaja **Taaraapiid**, occupied his brother's place. He was very cruel and inconsiderate. Much of the realm deteriorated under his reign. The subjects always prayed for his death and downfall. When three and a half years of his rule had passed, a fatal disease took hold of his body. How so hard the physicians tried to cure him, nothing availed and he died of that disease.³

1. The original clearly speaks of the king being asked to go to the temple of Tribhuvanavasvamin, which the king had built (RTK, IV: 102).
2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 50
3. The original says that he ruled for 'four years and one month, less six

Another brother of his, Raaja **Lalitaaditya** then sat on the seat of governance. Sepoys and subjects who had grown sick of his brother's oppressions found redress under his reign. Many, who had got exiled, returned to their land. Freed of the cares of his own county, he set out for conquest. Gathering a huge army he turned to Hindustaan.

Conquering Punjab he went to Kanooj and mounted a fierce attack on the king of that realm, called Yashoo Varmaa [Yashoovarman].¹ Countess people on both sides got killed. In the end, Raaja Lalitaaditya prevailed. The king of Kanooj was captured and most counties of Hindustaan came under his sway. Later, he freed the Raaja of Kanooj and restored his county to him fixing a tribute upon him. Thereafter, settling upon the conquest of Bihar and Bangaal, he started thence. When he drew near that realm, the ruler of Bihar came up and submitted to him. The king confirmed him in his rule. He boarded his army on boats and went to Bangaal over the river Gang.²

When he drew near the county, the ruler of Bangaal too came out with his enormous army, sailing on boats, to fight. A battle royale ensued between the two, upon the river. Finally the ruler of Bangaal fell and the whole realm came under Raaja Lalitaditya. Plenty of riches, goods and elephants came to his hand. From there he went to the shore of the sea and created a tumult there. Thereafter he went to Islands (?) of Deccan by ship and captured all the four (*kahind/kahand*?) islands. Kings of the area submitted to him. When he landed in Deccan, a lady named Rata, who ruled some counties there, came up with a large army and elephants to fight (Raaja Lalitaditya). She fought with so manly a courage that her valour was lauded by all. After much fighting, the army of Rata was brought under. The lady came unto the king. The king praised her much.

days' (RTK, IV: 123).

1. RTK, IV: 137-38.

2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 51

He went to other counties of Deccan and conquered them too, reaching the sea shore. There he and his army tasted coconut wine which he had not seen so far. Then, the king sent his army to the lands around the shore and conquered most of them. Thereafter, he turned to Maalva and conquered it. Thence he went to Gujaraat and captured it. Then he turned to the country of Andaapat (Indraprast), now known as Dahlii. Most of the kings enroute submitted to him; he destroyed the counties of those who remained defiant, and conquered all the forts that lay in the way,¹ till he reached Andapat and captured it.

From there he went to Punjab and resolved to conquer Kaabul. He fought many battles on those borders and gained more victories. A large number of horses fell into the hands of the king and his army, in those lands. When he reached the realm of Yaatkhaar, Muumin, the king of the realm, fought as many as four battles with the king. Having no more strength left, he sought respite from the Raaja. He acquiesced. Muumin came up and submitted to him.

The Raaja then conquered more territories and reached Kaashgar and Khatan. All the counties of Transoxomia and Turkistaan submitted to his authority. Then he turned to Khataa. He conquered some counties there after fierce battles. He took away all he could from that realm and returned to his own county. Returning via Tibet, he conquered all the counties enroute, and those who stood up against him, till he reached Kashmir.

There, he erected splendid buildings and constructed countless temples. He built a grand temple at Paraspuur. He raised a minar there, 54-yards high, built from a single stone. It still exists there. He also built other grand buildings, on each of which a lakh *toolas* of gold were spent.

From every realm that he rummaged through, he took the learned, the professionals and other skilled personnel with him.

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image](#) 52

Expenses were allocated to them, over and above what they had spent on their transit.¹

Among those captured from the various counties was a person called Chinkan. He was peerless in the science of chemistry and had no equal in wisdom and sagacity, besides being well-versed in other wonderous arts. The king took him along and brought him to his own realm. When he saw his high intellect and learning, he appointed him his ministry. Whatever quality of gold the king needed he made it available. Whenever the king faced a problem, he solved it with his wisdom. He'd weave such magic that the obstacle was overcome.

Once the king was confronted with a gathering of opponents at the place where five rivers meet. The numbers of the enemy were over whelming and the king could not fight them.² For some reason, there was no scope for reconciliation with the enemy. The five rivers loomed at his back making retreat without boats impossible and there was no trace of a boat anywhere. They found no escape. Raaja Lalitadatya was greatly perturbed. Just then the minister Chinkan came up to the king and said: "Do not trouble thyself. I will so contrive things that you will easily cross these waters, along with the army."

The king was much pleased to hear this. Chinkan brought out two gems from his pocket and threw one into the river. Immediately, a path appeared, and the waters flowing from above got fixed there. the king, with his huge army, passed through that river. Then Chinkan brought out the other gem.³ It pulled the other gem from the water and river began to flow as before. The enemies were left on the other side of the river. The king was very happy, and bestowed great riches on him. He enhanced his status from what it was before. The king asked the minister for the two gems. The minister offered them to him.

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image](#) 53

2. The original account does not speak of enemies but only the king was 'stopped by the streams which had united' i.e. flooded (RTK, IV: 248).

3. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image](#) 54

Raaja Lalitaditya had two flaws. One was that he passed unexpected orders in drunken stupor and later repented; the second that sometimes he went back on his word. Thus he brought Nobatii,¹ the king of Gavr and Bangaal, whom he had given a pledge and sworn that he would do him no harm, to Kashmir and forsaking his pledge killed him.

When the news of his killing reached Gavr, a number of his servitors came to Kashmir to avenge themselves upon Raaja Lalitaditya. They had disguised themselves as begars and mendicants.² Having entered the city, they got together one night and taking up swords killed a large number of the attendants of Raaja Lalitaditya. They put the city on fire and much of the city was gutted along with the inhabitants. They destroyed the mansions which had been built by the king at great expense. They perpetrated as much havoc as they could. When the day dawned, the king's armies besieged them and slayed all of them.³ A large number of king's men too got killed on that day.

Towards the end of his reign, Raaja Lalitaditya collected a huge army and set out northwards. He conquered many realms there. The king was much pleased with that land and realm, and sent⁴ word to Kashmir saying "Put whichever of my two sons you like on the throne in Srinagar in my place, for I shall not again leave this land and return." Of the two sons, the elder Koolyaapiidda [Kupalayaapiidda] and the younger Bajraadat [Vajraaditya]⁵, they put the elder one on the throne.

-
1. The original does not give the name of prince (RTK, IV: 323). It is translator's own addition.
 2. The original account says that they came under the pretext of visiting the shrine of Shaardaa (RTK, IV: 325).
 3. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 55](#)
 4. The original says over 18 *shlookas* (RTK, IV: 342-59) that the kings ministers, not getting any news of the king, had dispatched the messenger, who brought them the report (RTK, IV: 340).
 5. RTK, IV: 355.

Some opine that, somewhere in the north, Raaja Lalitaditya together with his army was caught in snows and killed. Some surmise that he had undertaken an onerous task which he could not accomplish despite hard endeavour and that furious at the embarrassment he lighted a huge fire and burnt himself in it. And that out of the huge army accompanying him none save the person he had sent with the message to enthrone one of his sons, returned; all got killed in that adventure. The length of the reign of Raaja Lalitaaditya, till his passing away, was thirty-six years and seven months.

His [Jayaapiidd's]¹ son Raaja **Lalitaapiidd**, succeeded him. He spent most of his time with women singers, in jesting and sport.² All the treasures which Raaja Jayaapiidd had collected during the last days, he squandered on futile pursuits. Unlike the practice in his father's reign, he gave nothing to the sepoys, the learned and other needy ones. Under his rule tomfoolery, immodesty and other rascalities became popular. He used to fault his father and other kings given to military campaigns. In his gatherings, every person who parodied wise and the venerated was rewarded richly by him. He gifted the singers robes imprinted with images of immodest women. Fearing his wrath, they wore those robes on festivities. He threatened those who refused these gifts and did not let them enter his company. Thus he ruled for twelve years and passed away.

His brother Raaja *Shamkaraapiid* [**Samgraamapiidda**], the son of Jayaapiid, then sat on the throne. He ruled for seven years and passed away.

1. Here the Persian translator has left out nearly 300 *shloocas*, covering the reigns of kings Kuvalayaapiidda, Vajraaditya, Prithviipiida Samgraamapiida and Jayaapiidda, who ruled in between 735-81 CE, approximately (RTK, IV: 372-659). The Persian translator is here talking of Jayaapiidd's son (RTK, IV: 650).

2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 56

Raaja Brihaspat alias Jiit/Chiit Jayaapiidd [Chippattajayaapiidda]¹, son of Lalitaapiidd the grandson of Raaja Jayaapiidd then succeeded his uncle. He was a child. His maternal uncles who were from the clan of vintners, interfered in all affairs of the state.² They vanquished the rulers in the surrounding areas and gathered huge riches. When Raaja Brihaspat attained to the age of discernment and signs of sagacity began to appear in his person, the relations were alarmed and got him killed through magic. His reign lasted twelve years.³

Then Raaja Ajyaapiid [Ajitaapiidda] son of Prabhuyaapiid [Tribhuvanaapiidda] the son of Nabipiid, [Bappiys]⁴ sat on the throne. During his time, the vintners were in total control. Nothing save the nominal kingship remained with Ajitaapiidd. He ruled for twenty-four years and died.⁵

Raaja Anangaapiidd son of Shankarapiidd [Samgraampiidda], the son of Jayaapiidd, sat on the throne with the support of the elders of the state. The vintner lords fought amongst themselves a lot. They deposed the king. He ruled for three years and passed away.

Raaja Utpalaapiidd, son of Ajitaapiidd, then sat on the throne. He is the last Kaarkoott king. Length of his reign was two years.

The total rule of the Kaarkoott kings, seventeen persons in all, was two hundred and sixty years, five months and twenty days from the first to the last. Thereafter the rule passed to the vintners.

1. RTK, IV: 676.

2. His mother was Jayaadeevii, the daughter of a spirit-distiller (RTK, IV: 677).

3. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 57](#)

4. Names as per RTK, IV: 689-90.

5. His reign lasted thirty-seven years (813-850 CE) as per Kalhana's original account (RTK, IV: 703).

RAAJATARANGINII

Of Kalhana Pandit

Book V

Raaja *Onat Varmaa* [**Avantivarman**]¹ son of Sukh Varmaa, the son of Utpal Distiller, sat on the throne with the aid of the minister Shuur, after much fighting with his clan. He threw out his enemies from amongst his own and his opponents and benefitted all who had been congenial to him. He thus overcame all.

He ordered that all the utensils and cups of silver and gold, received from the previous kings, to be broken. Pulverizing them all, he distributed them among the destitute. He refused to eat or drink from those utensils. From the royal articles he took nothing save the royal umbrella and the mace. After he had stabilized his rule,² he appointed his younger brother, Shuura Varman, his heir. He ruled for twenty-eight years, three month and three days and died.

Raaja **Shankar Varman**, son of Avantivarman, sat on the throne with the aid of the minister Ratan Vardhan and appointed his cousin, the son of his parental uncle, Sukha Varman, the son of Suuravarman, his heir. Differences arose between him and the king leading to a fierce battle. Famous captains from both sides were killed. Finally the king prevailed.

1. RTK, V: 2

2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 58

Thereafter, he resolved to go on a campaign in Hindustaan, and ordered his army to be arraigned. He set out through the Dantoor route with a hundred thousand cavalry, nine lac infantry and thirty hundred elephants and captured the country of Dabeel.¹

Prathii Chand, the king of Nagarkoott sent his son into his service. The king conquered that realm and captured Gujaraat and Deccan, too. Then he returned to Kashmir and got busy in founding habitations and raising buildings. During the last days a few commissions of his led to his disrepute and the deterioration of the state. In a war, an arrow suddenly struck him and he died of the wound. The length of his reign was eighteen years, seven months and nineteen days.

Raaja Goopaal Varman, the son of Shankar Varman, succeeded his father. He was honest and generous. He entrusted the administration to his minister Prabhaadkar Deev. The minister seized all the treasure gathered by the king through oppression and sent it to Udbandpoor, which he had founded. He bestowed the title Shahraaj on one of his persons, called Kamluka, and put him at the head of that town. After some time, enmity developed between Shahraaj and the minister.² The minister dismissed him and took control.

When the king attained to the age of wisdom and discernment and learned of the minister's perfidy, he resolved to kill him. Meanwhile the king suffered from biliousness of liver and died after a reign of two years.

Raaja Sakant [Samkatta]³, who was alleged to be a brother of Raaja Goopaal but was not his brother in truth, was then seated on the throne. He passed away after ruling for ten days.

1. As per the original account, the first county conquered was Darvaabhisaara (RTK, V: 141).
2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 59](#)
3. RTK, V: 242

Then Raaja **Sugandha**, the mother of Raaja Goopaal, sat on the throne of the kingdom. During her rule strife ensued between the lords. They fought one another and were not reconciled to the queen ruling. When the queen saw that things were not proceeding in her favour, she deposed herself. Her reign lasted two years.

Raaja **Paarth**, son of Nirjit Varman, the son of Sukh Varman then sat on the throne. He sent an army to arrest the queen Sugandha, who had gone to the county of *Naagrad* [Hushkapura]¹ to reclaim the rule, and put her in prison. He ordered that food and drink be withheld from her, till she died in the prison. Then the king's father, Niirjiit, interfered with the affairs of the state and getting a group of the lords and ministers to his side, deposed the Raaja. The length of his reign was fifteen years and two months.

Raaja **Nirjit Varman** succeeded to the kingdom after his son and passed away after ruling for one year. Raaja Chakra Varman, son of Nirjit, obtained the kingdom as per his father's will.² A group of his father's ministers again installed his brother, Raaja Partha, son of Nirjiit, on the throne. The brothers fought many a battle, wherein betimes Raaja prevailed and betimes Partha. Numerous chieftains from both sides got killed. Finally the ministers resolved to depose Raaja (Chakra Varman). His rule lasted ten years and two months.

Then, they put Raaja **Shuura Varman**, son of Nirjit Varman, on the throne. Since he had earlier accepted bribes from the influential ones, for appointments, and was unable to fulfill the demand, he was deposed and others put in his place for some time. First Raaja Partha, son of Nirjiit, was enthroned with bribes. Later, he was deposed and Raaja Chakra Varman, son of Nirjiit, who had been deposed once, was enthroned. The reign of Raaja Shuurvarmaa, from beginning to end, lasted two years and two months.

1. RTK, V: 259

2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 60

Raaja Shankar Vardhana [**Shambu Vardhana**], son of Meeruu Vardhan, then ascended the throne.¹ Thus aggrieved, Raaja Chakra Varmaa went to Sangraama, the influential *ddaangar*. Sangraama brought all his army to his aid and opened battle with Raaja Shambhu Vardhana. The Raaja received a grievous hurt in the battle and died of that injury. Raaja Chakra Varman again ascended the throne with the aid of *ddaangars* and cleared the kingdom of his opponents. Well known chiefs were slain.²

Freed from these worries, he engrossed himself in frivolous pursuits and ignored the affairs of the state. He assigned high positions to the relatives of a flirtatious woman, with whom he was besotted. Putting them incharge of the state affairs, he killed Sangraama *ddaangar*, the force behind his kingship, on an aspersion. This became the reason for public hatred against him. One night, the relatives of Sangraama charged into the palace of Raaja Chakra Varmaa and drawing their swords assaulted and killed him in one go. The reign of Raaja Shankar Varmaa lasted three years.

Raaja Unmat [**Unmatavanti**]³, son of Raaja Partha, then sat on the throne⁴, with the aid of Sharvatta. He was very cruel and authored many oppressions. He killed all his brothers and relatives and associated with wretches who persuaded him to imprison and disgrace Raaja Partha. Whoever obstructed him in these disreputable acts was sent to prison. He honored his evil guides. His oppression reached the extent that he killed innocent people to practice swordry and had no remorse thereupon. He ordered belies of pregnant women to be split to investigate the position of the child in the womb. His reign lasted ten years and one month. He died of Tuberculosis.

1. RTK, V: 303-4

2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 61](#)

3. RTK, V: 414.

4. c.f. RTK, V: 414

Raaja **Shuur Varman** attained to kingship a second time, after him.¹ It has been mentioned earlier.

After him Raaja **Shuur Varman** became the king for the second time. As mentioned before² his lineage was doubtful. Though young, he was very bold. He charged on Kamal Vardhan, the king of Maraaj with his army.³ With a force of a thousand men, he fought valiantly, but was defeated in the end. Kamal Vardhan gave chase and besieged the royal palace. The King's mother took him away to save his life.⁴

Kamala Vardhan did not accept the Kashmir crown after his conquest. Brahmans too did not accept his kingship and forced him out of Kashmir.⁵

Raaja *Jaskardeeva* [**Yashaskaradeeva**], one amongst the intimates⁶ whom the mother of Raaja Suurvarman had sent to the Brahmans to advocate the case of her son, was selected by the Brahmans to head the kingship on account of his persona, wisdom, eloquence and a pious disposition. Raaja Suur Varman's reign, on this turn, lasted about a month. He was the last of the *vintners*.

1. The Persian translator has been misled. It was not the earlier king Shuurvarma. Kalhana says that a young child, presented as his son, was crowned king as Shuuravarman II (RTK, V: 445-48).
2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 62](#)
3. The Persian translator is incorrect. The original account says that Kamalavardhana, the commander, charged upon the city and put the king's supporters to flight. (RTK, V: 451-55).
4. RTK, V: 455.
5. This is not what the original record says. As per Kalhana's account, he did not assume the kingship, but deferred to the Assembly to elect the new king. The assembly chose Yashaskara. Kalhana does not speak of Kamala Vardhana being exiled (RTK V: 456-58).
6. The Persian translator is not correct. Kalhana does not say he was 'an intimate' of the king's mother, or that he was sent by her. He tells that Yashaskar Deeva was an erudite but penniless Brahmana and that he was taken along by the queen's envoys on account of his eloquence (RTK, V: 469-75).

The total reign of that dynasty, comprising eleven persons, was eighty-three years and four months. Then the rule passed to a different family.

RAAJATARANGINII

Of Kalhana Pandit

Book VI

Raaja Yashaskaradeeva, son of Prabhaakar Deeva, the son of Kaama Deeva, the son of *Biiradeeva* [Viradeeva], who was one of the subjects of Raaja Meeruu Vardhana, sat on the throne with the approval of Brahmanas. The first order which he passed on occupying the throne was not to allow Brahmans into his house without being summoned.

Dacoity and thievery was so effectively banished under his rule that the shops and houses were left unlocked at night.¹ During his rule travelers and the poor could sleep wherever they happened to be (without any fear). He promulgated such laws as had never been enforced by the previous kings.² His grasp of state affairs and administration he was so incisive that people were wonder struck.

Wondrous tales are told of his justice, redress and wisdom. Amongst these is the one that a person sold a mansion, having a well, to a merchant under a deed saying that this mansion was sold on such and such date 'without the well'. The purchaser got

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image](#) 63
2. The translation is incorrect, the original states otherwise: '...he restored the ordinances of former kings which had fallen into abeyance...' (RTK, VI: 6).

the deed document modified and changed 'without the well' to 'with the well', in a subtle manner. This case came up before Raaja Yashaskaradeeva. All present there were baffled by it. The king slyly sent the seal to the merchant's house and called for the record of the expenditure of the said date.¹ There it was written that so much of an amount had been given to the clerk for modifying the deed document. Thus confronted the merchant was forced to accept the truth. Raaja fined and punished him. All the wisemen were amazed at his sagacity. Thus a long time passed.

One day, the king apprehensive of his own future affairs and actions, abdicated the kingship. He collected all fine and luxurious good, necessary for the wealthy in a high and huge mansion, appointed a learned Brahman there and started studies² under him.³ He lived there and passed the kingship to his heir Varnat Deeva, son of Kaama [Raamadeeva]⁴ Deeva.⁵

Varnat Deeva did not visit the king, enquiring neither of his health nor ailment. The Raaja became angry with him. Thereupon, he removed him from the kingship, in which he had spent one day and night, and imprisoned him. Meanwhile the Raaja fell ill. A minister named Parva Gupta, invaded the mansion and captured all the wealth in cash and kind that the Raaja had gathered there.

1. The Persian translation is inaccurate and confused. Kalhana tells that the king took the merchant's ring on a pretext, sent it to the merchant's clerk and told him that the merchant had asked for the account books of the period, when the transaction had taken place, to be sent to him (RTK, VI: 32-40).
2. Kashmir has had a long tradition of people studying the scriptures under qualified teachers. The tradition, which came under strain during the medieval times, was revived by Svaamii Raam, in the last quarter of the 19th century at the famous Shaiva Ashram at Fateh Kadal. The well known modern Shaiva scholar and saint, Iishvarsvaruup Svaamii Laxmanji, came from this school.
3. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 64](#)
4. RTK, VI: 90.
5. This, in the original is preceded by the description of religious endowments, consecration of Matthas, agrahaaras of the king (RT), VI: 8-89). The translator has omitted these. In fact, the Persian translator or the later editor has omitted these details all over.

He hit the king in the head and killed him.¹ The length of his reign was nine years.

As per his father's will Raaja **Sangraama Deeva**, son of Yashaskaradeeva Deeva, inspite of his young age, sat on the throne with the acquiescence of the minister Parva Gupt.² All power lay in the hands of the minister. First he killed all his opponents. Then, on a night of heavy snowfall, he entered the palace of Raaja Sangraama Deeva and told his soldiers to kill the minister Raama Deeva [Raama Vardhana], who sided with the Raaja, along with his son.³ Then they killed Raaja, too. He ruled for six months and seven days.

Then Raaja **Parva Gupt**, son of Samgraam Gupt, a commoner from the village Aadavan⁴ sat on the throne and subdued all his opponents. Clerks, who had been dismissed, extended their arms of oppression during his rule and pestered the subjects.

Raaja had heard much about the beauty of Gavrii, the queen of Raaja Yashaskaradeeva Deeva.⁵ He got besotted with her, and proposed to her. The queen replied that she would not consent until the Temple of Yashaskaradeeva Deeva in so and so village was completed. Raaja spent a huge sum and got that temple completed within a short span of time and demanded fulfillment of the promise. The queen said that performing *hooma*, which is the most sacred of all oblations among Hindus, was a prerequisite. Raaja got much fuel and materials collected and lighted a huge fire. The queen adorned herself with countless ornaments, put on precious robes and jumped into the fire. People from all sides hailed the queen and cursed the king. Within a short time, the

1. The original account speaks of the hit as insolence and says he was poisoned (RTK, VI: 106).
2. As per the original account Samgraama Deeva was onionted by the king before his death (RTK, VI: 99).
3. c.f. RTK VI: 126-129
4. Kalhana calls it *Paaree Vishooka* across the river Vishooka (RTK, VI: 130).
5. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 65

king fell ill on account of this curse and died after ruling for one year and four months.

Raaja **Ksheem Gupt**, son of Parva Gupt, then took his father's place. He was always engrossed in drinking and sport. He spent all the treasures on gambling and such other frivolous pursuits. He used to wear manifold ornaments and made his courtiers do the same. The wise and the elderly were parodied in his court; allegations were leveled on men and fines exacted from them; people and their families were outraged. And, thus the rule dragged.

One day he had gone on a hunt. There, he saw a flame emerging from the mouth of a jackal and was mortally scared. Liverish papules appeared on his body¹ and he died at Baarahmula.

Raaja *Ibaman* [**Abhimanyu**]², son of Ksheem Gupt succeeded his father. His mother, queen Dida became his guardian. Kardanraaja, his brother from a different queen, who shared the rule with Raaja (Abhimanyu), took the ashes of his father to Hindustaan for burial in the Gangaa.³ The queen and her son, relieved on his account, then got busy in consolidation of the rule and decimation of their enemies.

Soon, war ensued between the rulers of the realm and the chieftains. It led to conflicts all over. A Turk⁴ named Himmak and a chieftain from *Paraspuur* [*Parihaaspuura*] called *Vaarmat* [*Eramantaka*] came with a huge army and charged upon the

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 66](#)
2. RTK, VI: 188.

3. The translator is misreporting. Kardamaraaja was the son of Falguna, the prime minister, and had taken the late king's ashes for *visarjana*. The apprehensions of the king and his mother were regarding Falguna. They were allayed when Falguna too left to await his son's return (RTK, VI: 200-203).

4. There is nothing in Kalhana (RTK, VI: 211-213) to indicate that (Himmak) was a Turk. Stein says in the foot note to *Sh.*, VI: 213 that Haidar Malik and Narayan Koul call him a Turk (Stein Vol I, page 254). It is not clear, on what basis they do so while writing of the events of 958-72 CE, for which Kalhana is the only source. Apparently, they had used this faulty Persian translation.

queen.¹ Unable to counter them, the queen took refuge in the *Sharahmarah* [Shuuramattha]² fort.

Using much money, she enticed the soldiers of the opponents. People from all nooks joined her in the lure of money. Raaja Abhimanyu, who was at *Lyatapuur* [Lalitaadityapur] on queen's orders, came with a huge treasure and all his force to reinforce queen.³ Beating drums and blowing conches, he appeared on the very day the enemies had opened battle with the queen. The queen issued out of the fort and took the side of her son. Himmak and Eramantaka were scared and got slain on the battlefield.⁴ Other chiefs of theirs fled away. After the victory, the queen bestowed high offices on her servants and oppressing the (enemy) people, destroyed them. Raaja Abhimanyu ruled for fourteen years⁵ and died.⁶

Raaja *Pand Gupt* [Nandi Gupta] son of Abhimanyu came to be the successor of his father, with queen Dida's approval. Queen Dida was much aggrieved on the death of his father and secluded herself from the affairs of the state. She founded many villages and built many Shrines and Temples.⁷ Finally she got Raaja Nandi

1. The Persian translator has contracted the original account, making it a misleading summary. Apart these two, there were Mahima and Paattala grandsons of Parva Gupt through his two daughters and Udayagupta, Yashoodhara and other famous warriors from Lalitaaditya Pura (RTK, VI: 218-19).
2. RTK, VI: 223.
3. This is thoroughly incorrect translation of the original, which does not make any mention of Abhimanyu in this uprising against the queen. Nor did he bring any gold or treasures or reinforcement from Lalitaadityapuur (RTK, VI: 224-26). What Kalhana tells is that the queen brought off the warriors from Lalitaadityapura with gold (VI: 224) and broke the alliance. Then she brought round the grandsons (VI: 225), and the whole uprising was overcome (VI: 226).
4. There is no mention of their slaying in the original account (RTK, VI: 222-227). The two are mentioned again in connection with a later uprising, (RTK, VI: 238) in which they got killed (RTK, VI: 250, 255). The Persian translation omits it all.
5. Kalhana only gives the Year 48 (4048 LE) = 972 CE (RTK, VI: 292).
6. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 67](#)
7. The details of these temples are given by Kalhana (RTK, VI: 299-302).

killed in his youth, in a manner none could gauge. The length of the rule of Raaja (Nandii) was one year, one month and nine days.

Raaja **Tribhuvana**, son of Abhimanyu, succeeded his brother, with queen Dida's approval. He too got killed by queen. His rule lasted two years.

Raaja **Bhiimagupt**, son of Abhimanyu, succeeded his brother. Minister Falguna, the able incharge, passed away around that time. Thereafter queen Dida cared for none and did what she pleased. Some months later, on account of her apprehension from the Raaja, she removed him (from kingship) and imprisoned him. The length of the reign of the king was four years and three months.

Then, Raaja **Dida** sat on the throne. She made a herdsman named Tunga, whom she had trained, the incharge of affairs. Lords and ministers, pestered by Tunga, deposed the queen and put her nephew, named *Bayrahraaja* [Vigraharaaja]¹, on the throne. Tunga went underground. Vigraharaaja searched much for him but could not find him. Brahmans, who played middlemen, took much money as bribe from the queen² and Vigraharaaja returned to his own place, as his campaign did not succeed. Numerous partisans of his got killed at Tunga's hands. Tunga again became the influential confident and extracted all the monies Brahmans had been given as bribe by the queen.

Around that time, the ruler of Raajoorii rebelled against the queen and fought against her army. Tunga went there and subdued the Raaja. Thereafter the queen appointed her nephew Sangaraaja [Sangraamaraaja], son of Udairaaja, as her heir apparent.³ She passed away after ruling for twenty-three years and six months.⁴

From Yashaskaradeeva to Queen Dida, ten persons ruled for sixty-four years and twenty days.

1. RTK VI: 334-35.

2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [Image 68](#)

3. RTK, VI: 355

4. In the year 4079 LE = 1003 CE (RTK, VI: 365)

RAAJATARANGINII

of Kalhana Pandit

Book VII

Raaja **Sangraamaraaja**, son of Udairaja succeeded to the kingship. He was very caring. Since, none of the chiefs of the land possessed enough acumen, he maintained Tunga as incharge and entrusted the affairs of the state to him.¹

Around that time the Turk named Hamiir invaded Haibank (Afghanistan) and Triloochan, the chief of that realm, sought the protection of Raaja and took Tunga to assist him.² Tunga fought Hamiir with a huge force and was defeated. Triloochan too was beaten and Turks prevailed. Most of the men from the realm of Kashmir were killed.

Since, the Raaja was estranged with Tunga, one day the king in the court ordered³ that he along with his elderson, who was also a courtier⁴, be beheaded so that the other soldiers would not

1. Kalhana (VII: 38-41) tells of Tunga taking a lowly *aaramika* (*aaru'my* - vegetable gardener) as his assistant, showing the plasticity of caste in Kashmir (Stein, *Raajataranginii*, Vol I, page 270).
2. The translation gives the impression that Triloochanapaala took Tunga along, while the original account says that Sangraamaraaja sent him to help Shaahii Triloochanapaala (RTK, VII: 47).
3. Kalhana says the king was unaware of it (RTK, VII: 81).
4. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 69

complain. Despite it, the supporters of Tunga attacked the king and many people from both sides got killed. The king returned to the place. His ministers, joining the royal army, swelled their numbers and defeated the opponents.

The king continued on the throne. He appointed Tunga's three sons in place of their father¹ and sent them to fight the Turks. They too retreated from the battle field and the affairs of the state got deranged. The king had been suffering from dyspepsia from some years. He vomited whatever he ate, and his pain increased with each day. He passed away after ruling for 24 years and 2 months.

Raaja *Hararaaja* [**Hariraja**]², son of Sangraamraaja, succeeded his father on the throne. People became prosperous with his benevolence. None dared to oppose him. The surrounding Raajas too submitted to his suzerainty. He passed away after a rule of twenty-two years and some days [twenty-two days].³

Raaja **Ananta**, the son of (Hariraja) Sangraamaraaja, succeeded to the throne after his father.⁴ When the king was at Loohar Koott, his uncle called Vigharaja, did not pay him much heed on account of his young age, and charged upon him with a huge army.⁵ He occupied Loothikaamattha.⁶ Raaja returned to

1. This is incorrect. Kalhana says Tunga's brother Naaga was appointed in his place (RTK, VII: 100-101). Kalhana further says that Tunga's wife took two sons of Tunga and went to Raajoorii (RTK, VII: 104-105). The Persian translation has not founded the account of the events, in which Tunga got killed, given by Kalhana.
2. RTK, VII: 127. It'd have been noted that the Persian translation of this part which Kalhana tells in great detail is very cryptic and not precise.
3. The Persian translation is incorrect; Hariraja did not rule for "twenty-two years and some days" but was the king for a bare 22 days (RTK, VII: 131).
4. This is roundly incorrect. Hariraja was Ananta's brother, not his father. Ananta Deeva became king in 1028 CE, the same year as his father Sangramraaja died (RTK, VII: 134-35).
5. Vigharaja came from Loohara in rapid marches and entered the city after two and a half days (RTK, VI: 140).
6. The Persian translation says 'Loohara Kootta' which is incorrect. (RTK, VI: 141). Two sentences below it again says 'Loohara Kootta', which is also wrong.

Srinagar. Raaja's mother sent a huge army to fight Vigharaja.¹ She closed all the routes of his escape and burnt him down along with all his men in Lootthikaamattha. Not a single person escaped alive.

When Raaja grew to adulthood, he adopted benevolence as his motto, and spent the treasures for the public weal. Meanwhile, a *kshatrii* called Tribhuvana, with the aid of *ddaangars* charged upon the Raaja with a huge force. A fierce battle took place. Famous warriors from both sides came to be slain. Raaja displayed great valour in the battle. He sustained many injuries and finally emerged victorious. Tribhuvana was defeated. In thanksgiving, the Raaja distributed ninety-six crore in Kashmiri coin, among the people. He had been so engrossed in battle that his hand got stuck to his sword and could not be separated. Finally physicians poured a large quantity of milk upon it, and loosened his grip.²

Raaja Ananta entrusted all his campaigns to a person called Dulak, who had come from the famous Maalvaa king Raaja Bhooj, for erecting temples and shrines in Kashmir.³ Every day, he used to dispatch water from the holy spring of Mattan in Kashmir to Maalvaa for the bath of Raaja Bhooj.

On the instigation of Dulak, Raaja Ananta became oppressive to the people. Great quantities of *paan* were consumed in the court during that association. The revenues collected were not enough to pay for it and ten or twelve letters (of credit) were given to the procurers. When the debt could not be paid⁴, he preyed upon

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image](#) 70

2. Here the translation has omitted the succeeding account of an invasion of Daradas and *mleechhaas*, in which the invaders were thoroughly vanquished and most of them slain. The Shaahii prince Rudrapaala led this campaign (RTK, VII: 168-76).

3. The translation is incorrect. Dullaka was a foreigner who had become the king's favourite (RTK, VII: 189). The seller of betel leaves was another foreigner called Padmaraaja (RTK, VII: 190). He was also assigned by Raaja Bhooja to build at the holy *tiirtha* of Kapatteeshvara, not Mattan, and to dispatch the holy water to Maahaa (RTK, VII: 192-93). Kapatteeshvara is a sacred *tiirtha*, now known as Kuutthyaar.

4. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image](#) 71

the public properties.¹ Finally, one of his wives called Suurajmatii [Suuryamatii] gave her own treasures and gifts to Raaja's debtors and freed the subjects from this oppression. Thereafter she had the expenses of Raaja properly controlled.

After sometime, he abdicated the kingship to dedicate himself to prayer and penance. He entrusted the government to his son Kalasha and passed away. He ruled for fifty three years.²

Raaja **Kalasha Deeva**, son of Ananta, steadied himself on the throne after his father. Initially, under the influence of mischievous elements, he committed many acts of benevolence [evil].³ He entrusted the affairs of the state to the lowly and wretched; they outraged the people and their families. He made an evil person, called *Jaisanka* [Jayaananda]⁴, the incharge of all affairs, who led Raaja to commit various acts of obscenity and rascality.

His son, named Harsha Deeva, on the instigation of the corrupt and disruptive, rebelled against him. With the great treasures, which he had received from Raaja Ananta, he gathered a huge army and opposed his father. Since Raaja Kalasha had been a destitute from beginning to end, possessing no treasures and was under debt, he beseeched the people with assurances and sent them to his son for reconciliation. He allowed him to keep his treasures, bestowed enough *jaagiirs*, provenders etc., upon him and took him to the city.⁵ Thus he assuaged the public.

He was after collecting treasures. Around that time a well, about one and a half *kruh* across, full of black gold was found

1. There is no mention of preying upon the public for payment in the original (RTK, VII: 194-96).
2. The translation roundly omits the religious endowments, *Matthas*, Temples and palaces constructed by the queen Suuryamatii (RTK, VII: 180-87).
3. The text is probably mis-copied. It says: *dar avval haal azoo aimaali shaayista* (good deeds) *bavaasta sohbat ashraar* (mischievous elements) *khailii sar bar zad* instead of *aimaali naashaayista*, (evil deeds) ...
4. RTK, VII: 275
5. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 72

in the vicinity of a known jeweler, called *Jiiyoo* [Jayyaka].¹ The Raaja marched his army on Jayyaka, killed him and confiscating all his monies to the royal treasury, became rich.² He subdued the surrounding Raajaas and brought prosperity to the people. By and by he put the people, who had attained to high posts by bringing disruption between him and his father, to accidental deaths till the group lost all influence. In their place the Raaja promoted the group favoured by his ancestor and sent them on conquests. All areas from Nagarkoott and Siyaalkoott till Niilaab (Krishan Gangaa) and Chinaab came under his control.

Once during his reign, it was so cold that the waters of Vyath froze (so hard that) an army could easily pass over it. It may be noted that this year too, when this history is being written, it is said that it has snowed as hard in Kashmir and the waters of Vyath have frozen.³

After some time, treacherous elements led Harsha Deeva to evil ways and estranged him from his father. Since, Raaja loved him much, he first asked him to behave well. It did not avail. Finally he punished his associates and banished some of them.⁴ Around that time, Raaja's helmet burst and his nose began to bleed continuously. Physicians tried to cure but failed. When the illness became serious, he called his other son *Ankarsh* [Utkarsha]⁵ from Loohar Koott and commended him to the lords of the realm.

1. RTK, VII: 494.

2. This is an incorrect translation of the original, which says that Jayyaka was a farmer, who had accumulated much money through from revenue and trade. He used to busy this wealth in a huge trench 'for a kroosa and a half' in his land. He had become a *ddaamara* and was killed in a battle. The king then dug out the money (RTK, VII: 495-99).

3. i.e. 998/99 HE = 1590/91 CE (as per MM... image 189). It also tells that this Persian translation work was done outside Kashmir. Badaayuunii had not visited Kashmir and was unaware of the topography, the people and of course, its history.

4. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 73](#)

5. RTK, VII: 703

He assigned the treasure of Raaja Ananta to Harsha as promised and ordered him to leave Kashmir.¹ The ministers did not acquiesce in it and instigated Utkarsha to imprison him. Raaja kept mumbling the name of the Lord, synonymous with Harsha, till he passed away. His rule lasted twenty-six years.

Raaja **Utkarsha**, son of Kalasha, succeeded to the kingship of his father with the approval of the ministers. People of Kashmir who awaited the rule of his brother Harsha were dismayed at his rise.² Seeing this stance, he organized public feasts, gave away gifts and brought the people to his side. In the gatherings, he sought reprieve for Harsha and promised to free him from the prison.³ He appointed his younger brother *Vajiimal* [Viyaya Malla]⁴ heir. Viyaya Malla perpetually yearned for the release of Harsha and Raaja grew angry with him. Viyaya Malla went away to Laar and gathering a huge force charged upon Taashavaan⁵, the capital of Raaja (Utkarsha), to fight the king. He burnt down part of the city and brought to his side the group which favoured Harsha in the king and fighting valiantly, killed many of the Raaja's army. He sent a force to the prison to free Harsha.

When Raaja heard of it, he in the midst of battle sent two signet rings to the prison guards and said, "If the opponents prevail, I will send one of these rings, which is the signal for killing, and you should kill Harsha. However, if we overcome them, I'll send the other ring which is the signal for sparing his life and you should not kill him, so that he is not lost." It so happened that Raaja was overcome in the battle and sent the ring which signaled sparing

1. As the next sentence tells, Kalasha wanted to do so, but was opposed (RTK, VII: 705).
2. Like Hariraja, Utkarsha too ended up ruling for less than a month, 22 days in all (RTK, VII:861).
3. The translator in his characteristic inapt fashion is translating the import of *shloakas* VII: 745-47, which tell that Utkarsha had made a false promise to Harsha that he would free him.
4. RTK, VII: 760
5. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 74](#)

Harsha's life through Shuura, his son.¹ Shuura asked them to kill him but they found that the signal was otherwise.

Since Harsha was amiable and benevolent, had been kind to them and they wished he should rule, they sought to slay Shuura instead of Harsha. Since, the reverse had taken place, when Raaja came to know of it, he called Harsha's wife, named Shugalaa, who was in the palace, gave her much money and ornaments, sent her from the battle field to the prison² with the word that Harsha is alive.³ This gladdened his wife and Vijaya Malla was assured that Harsha lived. At the same time, Raaja sent a messenger to remove the shackles from Harsha's feet and fetch him from the prison into the battle field.

Raaja apologized to him, praised and honored him and sent him to Vijaya Malla to propitiate him. Meanwhile one of his confidants whispered to Vijaya Malla, "There is no doubt in the defeat of Raaja and Harsha himself has come to your hand. You should slay him, so that the kingship comes to devolve upon you without any fear, partner or apprehension." Vijaya Malla admonished him and strictly forbade any such act.

Wisely Harsha, with the excuse that he had been cramped in prison and had not had a ride for a long time, left his two younger brothers in battle and galloped to a corner. He ordered his own soldiers to bring the throne of Raaja Utkarsha to him. Right in the battle field, he (Raaja **Harsha Deeva**) sat on the side of the throne and as per the tradition of the earlier kings, ordered his wife Shuglala, mentioned earlier, to sit on the other side.⁴

1. "Shuura, son of Satya?" (RTK, VII: 802).

2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image](#) 75

3. He sent her to Vijayamalla (RTK, VII: 812).

4. Pleasingly melodramatic as this the Persian translation may be, it is not what the original account says. As per Kalhana, after Harsha met Utkarsha, he sent him to Vijaya to make him withdraw (VII: 817) and went to treasury (818); Harsha went to Vijaya (819), who grew happy (820) but his confidant advised him to kill him (821). Though Vijaya did not agree, Harsha recognized the content (822) and roamed around ready to flee for life (823). His followers gathered (825). After consulting Vijaya he turned to go inside to Utkarsha (826). Vijaya stopped him

Since people favoured him, they came to him in hordes, hailed him and submitted to him. When Raaja Utkarsha saw that tables had been turned in an instant because of his error,¹ he repented and closeted himself in his house. In the end he submitted to Harsha because of his own need.²

Initially, Harsha showed amity and honored him. Finally he sent him to prison. Vijaya Malla too went to Harsha, who assured him much. Harsha set upon governance, in the very state and robes in which he had exited the prison. That very night, Raaja Utkarsha, overcome by apprehensions, somehow killed himself. The length of his reign till his death was twenty-two days.³ Thereafter, Raaja Harsha, son of Kalasha, established himself on the throne.

On the very day of his ascension, he ordered that all the persons, who had been set to guard him in the prison and had been amicable to him, be awarded distinction and high stature. He bestowed great bounties and promotions upon them. With one stroke, he removed intimates of Raaja Utkarsha holding high positions and sent them to prison.

On the first day of his reign, he ordered that from each of the four gates of city, heavy chains be hung right to the royal palace and announced that every supplicant who entered through any of the gates should pull the chain and intimate the king so that his grievance is redressed.⁴

He himself attended to every issue-big or small-and did not relegate them to the ministers. He bestowed high positions on the father's associates. He ordered the people to come to the court well-dressed and suitably adorned. He was exceptionally

(827) and told him to seat himself on the throne (828) which his servants brought to him there (RTK, VII: 828).

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 76](#)
2. He was dragged out of the palace and led to another mansion by Harsha's men and put under guard (RTK, VII: 832-34).
3. RTK, VII: 832-34
4. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 77](#)

gracious towards his younger brother Vijaya Malla, with whose efforts he had attained to kingship and commended him greatly. He bestowed great honours and awards on him in his court.

Later, due to the mechanizations of the evil minded, he got estranged with him leading to discord between them. Vijaya Malla left and fought many battles with him displaying his valour. He got defeated and took refuge with a foreign chieftain called Daamuudhar Shah. At the end of winter, with the aid of the sect of *ddaangars*, he set out for the capital to fight Raaja. All of a sudden a slab of ice broke away from the mountains and fell on his tent. Vijaya Malla died under that avalanche.

Raaja Harsha dominated all and the border Raajas submitted to him. He ordered that people should not cut their hair contrary to the prevalent custom and as per the manner of previous kings, and that they should wear ear-rings and turbans. These customs did not exist prior to his rule.

He had so much wealth that every night a thousand torches and chandeliers were lighted in his court. He wedded three hundred and sixty women in a year, bedding one every day. This was not the last of his idiocies.¹ One among these is that a person came to him and said that he could gather the delicate fibres from the lotus-frond and weave them into cloth of exceeding finesse. He also said, "I can tell of dreams, write on air and can open doors from the hinges."² The king took a crystal from him and became his devotee. He gave him so much money that the treasury got emptied. The person asked the king to break the silver figurines gathered by the previous raajaas and spent them on his own person. Things came to a point that revenue collectors were sent to the country-side to seize horses and cattle, sell them and put the money in his treasury.

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 78

2. The translator has taken the examples given by Kalhana in *shlooka* VII: 1078 to be a report.

A person drew the figure of the wife of the *raaja* of Dakhan, named Chandalaa, and brought it to the king in Kashmir.¹ He so praised her beauty and attributes that the king got bewitched by her in absentia. He gave the person much money and a few elephants and remained besotted with that figure for a long time. He consulted his counselors about invading Dakhan and capturing the lady. They evinced agreement with the proposal and consented to go on the campaign.

Meanwhile, the author of that drawing named Madan submitted that the king could conquer Dakhan with a little force and the queen would be captured.² He further said that she possessed vast treasures and proposed that he would go, become her servitor, and keep watch over her: 'If you command me, I can do it since I had been her treasurer and she has full confidence in me'.

Pleased with this, Raaja ordered his engagement and that he be provided whatever he wanted. That person came a few days later and said to the king: "This woman is as good as your wife and must have befitting clothes and ornaments so that I can watch her with full dignity." The Raaja ordered fine clothes and bejeweled ornaments be provided to him. Thus every now and then, he would tell the king that his 'wife' should have such and such things and the king made it available to him.

Likewise, one of his courtiers brought an old woman to him and said, "This is your mother named so and so and that I have brought her from heaven, with great effort spending much money, to meet you." The Raaja believed him. He came respectfully, touched her feet and bestowed on her all the riches he had. In the same manner some people brought women, clothed in finery and well adorned and said, "These are the fairies of heaven who have come to see you." The king put his hands to his forehead

-
1. 'When he saw the picture of Chandalaa, he was struck by the god of love' (RTK, VII: 1119).
 2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 79](#)

and saluted them and expressed much mirth.¹ As they had been coached they said to the king, "Bring us enough money and tell us your desires so that we'll fulfill them." The king believing them totally said, "I want long life." Taking the money they prayed and said, "You'll have a long life and your reign shall last for ages." A person said that he could produce an elixir which made the old young again. Raaja believing made him a courtier and provided him whatever he needed to produce his medicine. One day his glance fell on the tall fruit trees, near his palace. He got angry and said, "Since these trees have grown taller than my palace, they must be punished." He ordered all those trees to be cut down. Thus, he ruled for twelve years and passed away.

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image](#) 80

RAAJATARANGINII

Of Kalhana Pandit,

Book VIII

Raaja Uchal [Uch-chala], son of Kusal [Malla], then sat on the throne, with the aid of his younger brother Sussala [Sus-sal] and the sect of *ddaangars*.¹ He too shared the ancestor of Raaja Harsha, by five generations. He was a man of unparalleled courage, valour and sagacity. He was extremely brave. With a small party of *ddaangars* he came from Raajoorii and captured the throne. Though he had few possessions, he rose rapidly in ranks. He fell out with his brother named Sussal and sent him to rule Loohar.²

With benevolence and bounties he brought round the sect of *ddaangars*, who were lowly people always in need, and thus stabilized his rule. Ruling with justice, he earned a good name. Roaming the lanes and bazaars in the garb of a destitute at night, he used to enquire of the straits of the people. If he heard of his good name, he was pleased and saddened if people spoke ill of him, and thus was ever reforming his acts and orders.³ Army

1. RTK, VIII: 2-3

2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 81](#)

3. This is a mistranslation of the original account which says that the king remained in the outer court the whole day listening to people and was ready to subdue any opponent even at mid-night, as per Bhimadeeva's counsel (RTK, VIII: 45-47). The Persian writers are obsessed with this Navsheevanii-fix of the king roaming the streets at night and bringing succor to the people, which they consider the ultimate virtue in a king. For one, it is a mere legend and may have never happened. Besides,

and subjects prospered under him. None had any complaint with him. He was insistent that every service should be recompensed and was very benevolent to people. Under his rule, famine never broke out. He had bodies of spies in all towns and cities, who informed him daily of the good or bad state of the subjects.

First of all he imprisoned all the thieves so that they would give up their wont. If they did not reform, he put them in prison, and assigned stipends to them, or chaining their feet, he put them to masonry work. He did not consent to slaying of the sinners, unless needed. He was so generous that it pleased him much when anyone asked for something; he gave more than what was asked and begged them to take more. He gave up all expenses that were over and above those of the subjects. He personally attended to the aggrieved and gave redress to all.¹

When any agricultural calamity befell, he sold his own grain so that no destitute would die of hunger. He built hospitals in his realm where food and medicines were made available to the sick. Along with these qualities, he was much given to games and fights. On every festival, he made the soldiers fight. A large number got killed and many were injured and maimed. He was thrilled at this.

When he assumed the reign, Sussal rebelled. The Raaja appointed a huge army to fight him. This army attacked him and defeated him and returned to the Raaja with a huge bounty. Many renowned warriors on the side of Sussala too were killed. Sussala's family, then, was at Loohar Koott. Raaja did not confiscate his brother's properties and possessions after the victory.

it is neither practical nor useful from the point of public weal. Only the head of a small city can do so. It is highly doubtful if a ruler can inform himself of the straits of the people, in this way. The proper way is Chanakya's module of having a body of spies, which the king is said to have done.

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 82

Meanwhile, Bhikashar [Bhikshaachara]¹, the young son of Raaja Harsha was captured by Raaja at Looarkoott. Initially, Raaja decided to kill him, but when he saw his innocence, he handed him over to one of his wives to be brought up.² Later he ordered someone to bring him from his wife for killing. out of kindness, the wife who had brought up Bhikshaachar, sent the hangman a likeness of Bhikshaachar to hang, sending Bhikshaachar secretly to the Maraaj county through a Brahman.³

When the *raaja* of that county, named Saram [Naravaraman]⁴, learnt that the heir to the kingdom has come to him for training he coached him in archery and other soldierly arts. When he reached adulthood, the people from the surroundings gathered around Bhikshaachar. Hearing of it, Raaja Uchal grew apprehensive and endeavored to do away with him.

Meanwhile, a clerk's son named Rad, [Radda]⁵ who fraudutently claimed to be a scion of Raaja Yashaskar and had reached from a clerk's post to that of a minister though the benevolence of Raaja Uchal, gathered a group of factitious self-seekers. One night, deceiving Raaja, they fell upon him. The length of the reign of Raaja (Uchal) was ten years, four months and two days.⁶ Restore

1. As he was born after two or three sons died, they gave him the name Bhikshaachar (begger)...; he was a boy of two years (RTK, VIII: 16-18).
2. Kalhana says he spared him at the advice of Janakachandra (*loc.cit.*).
3. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 83
4. Kalhana says that Bhikshaachar, finally reached Maalva, ruled by Naravaraman (RTK, VIII: 228).
5. RTK, VIII: 183.
6. The Persian translator has roundly omitted Kalhana's report of the restoration of all the temples damaged by Harsha, which is described in detail in the original (RTK, VIII: 77-81): restored the whole town of Nandiksheetsra (77); renovated Chakradhara, Yoogeesha, and Svyambhu (78); Vishnu image of Parihaaskeeshava was put afresh (79); adorned Tribhavanasvaamin with a new shuukavali (80); renovated the throne damaged at Harsha's overthrow (81). Likewise, the Persian translation omits his endowments, described by Kalhana at length (RTK, VIII: 243-49).

Then, Raaja **Radda**, son of Sadda succeeded Raaja Uchal, with the aid of his brother called Chudda. In the very night people submitted to him. He ordered conches and drums to be sounded and sat on the throne, in the same blood-splattered clothes in which he had killed the Raaja. He took over the governance as if he had been a king all his life. Within the night, he called the associates of Raaja Uchal with a pretext and killed them. He consoled his supporters and promised them higher positions and rewards. One watch of the night was left when hearing of this a loyal commander of Raaja Uchala,¹ charged down from Laar and crossing the bridge entered Srinagar. Other supporters of Raaja Uchal who still lived, joining him out of loyalty swelled his force.

Raaja Radda came out with his brothers and a great battle ensued. Girding up he displayed great valour. Wellknown captains and commanders from both sides got slain. Raaja was about to supervene and throw off his opponents, without any body doubting his victory, when the tables turned and Raaja Radda lost nerve and gumption. He fell down and sought his mercy.² Gulchand [Gargachandra]³ ordered that his ears and nose be cut off and he be killed after much torture; that a rope be put around his neck and he be dragged over unsavory spots. His soldiers were captured from all sides wither they had fled. He had ruled for one night and one day.

Raaja **Salhan**, son of *Kulmal* [Mallaraaja]⁴ who was the younger brother of Raaja Uchal through by a different mother, then sat on the throne with the support of Gargachandra. Thus wondrously, within the space of one night and day, there ruled three kings — Raaja Uchal and Raaja Radda who got slain and Raaja Salhana who got the throne. Though after the killing of Raaja Radda,

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 84](#)

2. The Persian translation is incorrect. The original says he fell, fighting valiantly (RTK, VIII: 247).

3. RTK, VIII: 348; the punishment was ordered to be inflicted on dead Radda.

4. RTK, VIII: 373.

people pressed Gargachandra to take over the kingship saying that Salhana was not capable to rule, he did not accept the throne.

Prior to Salhana being crowned,¹ Gargachandra had called Raaja Achal's real brother Sussala from Loohar Koott to ascend the throne. When, on his summons, Sussala reached Srinagar with his force, he got the news of crowning of Raaja Salhana and Gargachandra's letter that now the kingship has been settled on Raaja Salhana and that his coming was of little avail and that he should turn back. Sussala did not accept this and gathering a huge force threatened to wage war. Gargachandra, to protect the Raaja, took him to the vicinity of Baarahmula.² Meanwhile, due to his young age and innate cruelty, Raaja Salhan killed many of his own associates without any fault of theirs. Having estranged Gargachandra, he was in the mind of killing him but saw no aid and finding the task too much, said to his men, "It is not proper to keep him in his command as it would impact the peace and order in the realm." He appointed his younger brother from the same mother, named Lootan, [Lotthana]³ over Gargachandra to bring his (Gargachandra's) opponents round to him and waged war with him.⁴

In the contest, Gargachandra evinced great swordsmanship and killed the prominent captains and commanders of the Raaja.⁵ The battle ranged from morning till the sunset. After this valourous display, he took the road to Laar. Despite the persecution he had suffered at the hands of Raaja he did not go to Sussala and did not seek Raaja's dethronement.⁶

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 85](#)
2. ...the original account says 'to Hushkapura' (RTK, VIII: 390).
3. RTK, VIII: 373-74, 433
4. The original says that the attack on Gargachandra, not war, was begun by Tilakasimha without seeking the king's orders (RTK, VIII: 430), though the king did not restrain them and sent Lotthana to encourage them (RTK, VIII: 433).
5. The translation is not correct. Nobody was killed in the attack. Gargachandra did not come out of his house during the attack (RTK, VIII: 430-35).
6. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 86](#)

Later, the Raaja too remembering his services repented his actions and sent Gargachandra messages of reconciliation. Since, he had lost trust in Raaja, he did not accept and Raaja again sent a large army against him. They failed and retreated.¹ Raaja ordered the commanders to be picked out of every village and tortured and killed.² Now, Kulchand was forced to issue out. He met Sussala, made peace with him and brought him to Srinagar.

Sussala stood up near the Raaja's palace, when suddenly one of the Raaja's supporters jumped from above to crush Sussala (under his weight). He missed and no harm was done to Sussala.³ Raaja's men gathered from all sides and a battle began. Famous warriors from both sides got slain. Finally Sussala was victorious. Raaja Salhan and his brother Lootthan, in agitation and despair, fell at the feet of Sussala. Outwardly consoling them with promises, he told them to repair to a certain house for the present, since there was much anger on account of the recent fight and to come later. With this pretext he imprisoned both siblings. Raaja Salhan's rule lasted six months and twenty-seven days.

Raaja **Sussala**, son of *Kulmal/Gulmal*⁴ [Mallaraaja], then sat on the throne with authority.⁵ In view of the treachery Raaja Uchal had suffered, he always remained armed, and never put the sword away from himself. He killed all the people who had betrayed Raaja Uchal and destroyed their families. He did not trust Kashmiris and prevented their ascendancy.⁶ He had full

1. The translation is incorrect. No army was sent against Gargachandra, as per the original account (RTK, VIII: 436-49). An army was later sent against Sussala; Garga destroyed it (RTK, VIII: 451-53).
2. The translation is, again, incorrect. These actions were with regard to the conspirators who had killed Raaja Uchala (RTK, VIII: 443).
3. The original says that a gate was thrown down (RTK, VIII: 462).
4. The Persian translator writes the name with *kiif* and *gaaf* at different places. These have been reproduced as such. The name given in the original account is Mallaraaja (RTK, VIII: 373-74).
5. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 87
6. The translation is totally incorrect, probably mischievous. The word Kashmiris has been added by the translator and is not in the original text of Kalhana. The original only says: 'As he had seen the wickedness

control and command over the palace and did not give entry to anybody without reason. Fearing treachery, he did not allow free obessience. None save the trusted, was allowed into the court.

After establishing his sway, he ordered Gargachandra's exile from Kashmir. Gargachandra brought an unknown son of Raaja Uchal from some place and crowned him, in the vicinity of Aadavan, and set out to fight the army of Raaja Sussala.¹ In that encounter he slayed numerous persons in Raaja's party, and many lords and ministers tasted death. A large group that remained was taken prisoner.

After this mishap, Raaja Sussala himself went to the Bijbihara and fought the opponents. Avenging his losses, he overcame them. Defeated, Gargachandra went to the Ratnavarsha² Fort. Raaja chased him and destroyed the fort. Hemmed in, Gargachandra took Raaja Uchal's son and submitted to the Raaja. The Raaja interned him³ and uprooting his opponents returned to the city. A few months later, he went⁴ to Loohar Koott and imprisoned Salhan and Lootthan there.

One day a group of *Ddaangars*, deceiving the Raaja during a hunt, attacked him with swords.⁵ With the great circumspection that he had, he caught hold of a horse, jumped onto it in the injured

of the people, he has never himself ...' (RTK, VIII: 484). The succeeding sentences are also absent in the original.

1. The Persian translation is incorrect. The original account does not say that he was not Uchala's son; Garga did not crown him, though he did wish to do so (RTK, VIII: 500).
2. Parihaaspura (Paraspoor of the Persian translator) could not be correct as Garga was in and around Deevasara all the time. He went to Parihaaspura after he had been defeated (RTK, VIII: 504-15).
3. The Persian translator is not correct. The original account says that Sussala, elevated him greatly in stature to secure his services. (RTK, VIII: 520).
4. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 88
5. The translator is either mistaken or misreporting. The reference is to the erstwhile *ddaangara* supporters of Garga, going to Raaja when he was at Lookapunya seeking his support. He beat them there, whereupon their supporters attacked him. He had a narrow escape (RTK, VIII: 522-29).

state and somehow made away from there alive. Meanwhile, his army mounted an assault and put the miscreants to sword.

Around that time, Bhikshahaachar, the son of Raaja Harsha mentioned above, had taken refuge with hill *raajas*. With the aid of Raaja of Khashaas, named Naras, he was crowned king. People, who had been exiled by the previous kings, joined his army in hordes, enhancing his prowess. He issued from Kohistaan. Reaching the vicinity of Chinab River he forged an alliance with a landlord called Danak Paal, who had enough supporters and wealth. With his aid he gathered much war-material and set upon conquering the land.

About that time, Raaja Sussal ordered Gargachandra along with his three sons, who were very powerful and brave, to be interned and killed. Thereupon Raaja's lords and ministers revolted and dispute ensued. Raaja charged upon Raajoorii at the head of his army. Soom Paal, the Raaja there, brought Bhikshahaachar from *Baalaapoor* [Vallaapura]¹ against Raaja Sussala. For seven months, Raaja remained grounded there.² Whatever treasures he had with him was spent on the upkeep of the new recruits, cavalry and infantry. Bhikshahaachar overcame the army of Raaja through superior numbers. Raaja sent his sons and family to Loohar Koott.

Srinagar was left unguarded. Transgressing *Ddaangars* looted and repined, the city. They burnt down the royal palace. A thousand or so of Raaja's men were killed in the different battles they entered into. For a few years, wars, conflicts and discord continued on a daily basis.³ Sometime the party of Raaja prevailed, but more often it was the group supporting Bhikshaachar who had the upper hand.

1. RTK, VIII: 542. Vallaapura is the present-day Bilaavar, in Kathua district.
2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image](#) 89
3. The translator is wrong. It was not years, as per the original account (RTK, VIII: 542-55).

Since, Raaja was hemmed in and people did not obey his orders he, one day, took 5000 of his men and went to the village called Taapar, on the pretext of an outing. He had his family with him. A local lord named Tilak, who was estranged with Raaja and had remained aloof, came unto Raaja there and offered him his hospitality. Outwardly he was reconciled with the Raaja and said that he'd go to Kamraaj, raise a huge army and defeat the enemy. Secretly, at night, he sent a messenger to Kalyaan, the famous commander of Bhikshaachar, saying "The Raaja is broken down and has come here with a small force. Why do you tarry?" Marching through the night he assaulted Raaja. The Raaja wriggled out and forming gorilla parties to fight them,¹ he escaped after much travail. All the men he had with him got killed and he reached Loohar Koott alone, in shame. Bhikshaachar returned to Srinagar in glory. Seven years and two months had then, passed since Raaja Sussala's taking over the kingship.

Raaja **Bhikshaachar**, son of Harsha, then sat on the throne. Within a short span he overcame the enemies and instilled his fear in their hearts. The leftover riches of Raaja Sussal were distributed among the soldiers. He put a man called *Banab* [Bimba]² in charge of the state affairs. Within a few months, he fell into the company of clods and flatterers and spent money on frivolous pursuits. Foul deeds and indecent acts got committed by him. The gentry abstained from his company. His word was like writing on water. It created disenchantment among the elite. His courtiers, seeing his behavior and acts, retracted their submission to him. There was *inter se* discord and oppression became the rule. Raaja could not quell the disaffection.

About that time, he deputed Bimba to Loohar Koott to subdue Raaja Sussala. In his absence, he took over his wives for his own use. Bewitched with them, he did not attend to the affairs of the state. Hearing of it Bimba was dismayed and disappointed and

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image](#) 90
 2. RTK, VIII: 862

could not accomplish the task. Other known courtiers too left the Raaja. They wrote letters¹ to Raaja Sussala and called him back.

Raaja Sussala issued out from Loohar Koott and proceeded to fight Bimba. On his side Bimba took Soom Paal, the Raaja of Raajoori and a huge army of Turks, and many other sects and reached Punchh to confront Raaja Sussala. A fierce battle ensued between them. Raaja Sussala arraigned the small, mostly disheartened, force he had and charged valorously upon the enemy lines. The fighter of Soom Paal called Muhiib,² who was a known warrior, got killed at the hands of Raaja. The Turks, known for their warring, were stunned by the prowess of Raaja Sussala in archery. Since, most of Bimba's men had been killed and the rest had fled away, he along with the remainder force submitted to Sussala and commanded by him turned to Srinagar.

Raaja Bhikshaachar sent his commanders to prevent the entry of Raaja Sussala. Whosoever he sent on this task, he took that route to go over to Raaja Sussala. Then Raaja Bhikshaachar himself went to fight him. Meanwhile, the citizens rose against him and created disruption. Raaja Bhikshaachar was forced to return. Every commander he sent to fight Sussala fled away. Raaja Sussala entered Srinagar through Laar. People of the city went to welcome him, blowing conches and beating drums. Six months had then passed since Bhikshaachar had assumed the kingship.³

As Raaja Sussala became king for the second time, Bhikshaachar fled to Raajoorii. Raaja Sussala's army chased him. Raaja Soom Paal of Raajoorii joined Bhikshaachar with a huge force. Raaja Sussala himself went to fight Bhikshaachar and got

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 91](#)

2. This name is not there in the original account of the battle (RTK, VIII: 884-924). There, however, is a specific mention of Sussala killing Soomapaala's maternal uncle who is not named (RTK, VIII: 920).

3. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 92](#)

defeated.¹ Most of his men were slain, and Bhikshaachar again gained prowess.

Raaja Sussala gave much money to Loons and other rebellious sects to bring them to his side. They took Raaja's money but due to mistrust of Raaja repaired to their own places. Great wars betwixt these two raajas took place over long years, without anybody gaining the upper hand. Betimes this army was victorious, and betimes that. Economy of Kashmir suffered much on this account. People dismayed with the circumstances and Raaja Sussala, grew unhappy at the events. Fearing him people went to Bhikshaachar but finding no solace there returned to the Raaja. Their endeavors remained futile. Raaja Sussala was dismayed at the disunity of Kashmiris and grew sick of his kingdom.²

Accordingly, Raaja Sussala summoned his son, named Jai Singh [Jaya Simha], whom Raaja Uchal had brought up in his palace with special care to keep Sussala on track, from Loohar Koott via Baarahmula. Since, he was a righteous, just, young and wealthy, people were happy at his coming and submitted to him.³ The opponents were worried at his coming. Ten years and one month in total of the reign of Raaja Sussala had passed when he appointed Jaya Simha his successor.

1. This is not correct. The original account is much detailed and reverse of what the Persian translation says. Far from speaking of 'defeat' Kalhana lauds Sussala for exquisite bravery displayed and the victory he obtained (RTK, VII: 913-25). Kalhana says that Sussala displayed great valour at the battle and 'washed off all his disgrace' at the earlier ouster (VII: 917-18), and how 'with his few troops he slew, shattered and routed' the enemy (VII: 921). Kalhana also has high praise for the Kashmiri warriors in this battle (VII: 922). He also tells that Soom Paala was defeated and Sussala returned victorious to rule in Kashmir (VII: 923-25). The Persian translator has either mixed up names in his account or else he has been misled. The end result of this battle was the restoration of Sussala.
2. This account of the Persian translator is not as per the original. Bikshachara came to rule Kashmir in 1121 CE, overthrowing Sussala after a decade-long reign. Within months his supporters were disenchanted with him. The battle followed and after 6 months and 12 days in the year 97 (4197 LE = 1121 CE) Sussala regained the rule 954. Bikshachara made a couple of attempts to regain power but did not succeed. (RTK VIII: 817-954)
3. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 93

Let it be clear that the account of Raaja Sussala and his son Raaja Jaya Simha, translated above, carried many redundancies and digressions. Hence this selection was made. Whoso ever wants may refer to the original.¹

Raaja **Jaya Simha**, son of Raaja Sussala, occupied the throne with the approval of his father. Raaja Sussala stayed on to guide him and steered the affairs of the state as advisor. Peace reigned in the realm.

Much later, Bhikshaachar again created disturbance and battled for many years with Raaja Sussala, making great efforts. Betimes he won and betimes he was vanquished. Both Raaja's remained at war, hoping to overcome each other. When Raaja Jaya Simha attained maturity, some distracters created differences between him and Raaja Sussala. Raaja Jaya Simha estranged with his father, allied with the Raaja of Raajoorii, and sent secret messages to Bhikshaachar.²

Raaja Sussala's servant, called *Abal*, [Utpala]³ whom he trusted fully, killed Raaja Sussala on instigation of Bhikshaachar's minister, Tak, and fled away through Hurupura. By chance he was captured by one of Raaja Jaya Simha's ministers. He brought him to Raaja which pleased the Raaja much.⁴ After a long time,

1. The Persian translator is not correct. Actually, the account of Kalhana here is very detailed. Book VIII of Raajataranginii is the most extensive of all the tarangs. It is an eyewitness account of the reign of the first three kings of the 2nd Loohara Dynasty. Kalhana describes the reigns in minute detail, describing the happening of short months over many shloocas. This, apparently, has confounded the Persian translator who finds the details redundant, and says that the conflicts ranged over long years. The Persian translator has contracted the 3400 *shloocas* of the Book VIII into 16 pages totaling less than 200 lines. It is easy to gauge how contracted the account of the Persian would have been. No wonder that the whole account becomes a bagful of wars and inaccuracies.
2. The original does not say, anywhere between the crowning and death of Sussala, that he allied with the Raaja or Bhikshaacha (RTK, VIII: 1232-1316).
3. RTK, VIII: 1245.
4. The Persian translation is incorrect. The original says that commander of the watch-station at Shuurapura, caught Utpala, who was coming to

Bhikshaachar again waged war, a second time,¹ with Raaja's men. He was roundly defeated and took refuge in the Baanihaal fort.

Raaja Jaya Simha camped at Bijbihaarah and sent a commander, named Adii [Udaya],² with enough force to confront Bhikshaachar. Fierce battles took place between the two. Bhikshaachar fought with great valour. Finally the group of men with whom Bhikshaachar had taken refuge joined Raaja's army. This led to Bhikshaachar's decline and his defeat. Meanwhile fighting broke out and an arrow struck Bhikshaachar. He died of that injury.

Raaja Jaya Simha had proclamations heralded all over the realm. Thus stabilized in his kingship, he took justice and redress as the planks of his reign. Wisemen were promoted in his rule. A learned Brahman named Kalhana wrote the history of kings of Kashmir in *Hindi*,³ titled Raajataranginii during his rule. It was translated into Persian during the rule of Akbar Shah. The history began in the year 653 of *kaliyuga*, reckoned by Hindus as one of the four Eras, when Raaja Goonand, contemporaneous with the Paanddavaas, ruled in Kashmir. Starting the history with the said king and bringing it to Raaja Jaya Simha, (Kalhana) recorded the affairs of kings of Kashmir over the past 3596 years.⁴

End of Raajataranginii of Kalhana Pandit

raise a revolt, killed him and took his head to the king at Avantipura (RTK, VIII: 1577-80).

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 94](#)
2. RTK, VIII: 1674
3. It is strange that its translator should call the language of Raajataranginii Hindi, in place of Sanskrit.
4. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 95](#)

Remaining part of the affairs of Raaja Jaya Simha to those of Sultaan Zainulaabdiin, whose description shall, *Allah*-willing, shall be given below among the Muslim kings, have been recorded by a Brahman named Juulii¹ in a different history.

1. Why the Persian translator calls 'Joonaraaja' by the distorted name 'Juulii' is hard to guess. This name does not appear anywhere in the record. Joonaraaja died suddenly and left his history incomplete. The colophone to his Raajataranginii too was written by his pupil Shriivara, who calls him Shrii Joonaraaja (Kaul, Joonaraaja, *ibid.*, Sanskrit text, page 179). In the beginning of his chronicle, Shriivara mentions Joonaraaja thrice speaking of his undertaking the work (RTS, I:1: 5), sudden death in the year 35 i.e. 4535 LE/SE equivalent to 1459 CE (RTS, I:1: 6) and speaking of his not being of so high a caliber as to carry forward the work of his guru with an equal mastery (RTS, I:1: 7). All through, he gives the name Joonaraaja.

RAAJATARANGINII

Of Joonaraaja

Raaja **Jaya Simha** was twenty-two years old when he attained to kingship. He ruled for twenty-seven years and passed away.¹

Raaja Parmaanak, [**Parmaanuka**]² son of Raaja Jaya Simha succeeded his father upon the throne. He was insane and mindless. He troubled the subjects much and did not pay his army. He was always after collecting money.³ He collected monies through cruelty and persecution.⁴ He did not spend anything for himself and lived in deprivation.⁵

Two rogue courtiers of his, finding him gullible showed him strange objects and dangerous images and, saying frightening things, scared him and took away the monies, collected by him through cruelty, on the pretext of alms and donations. Thus they

1. This dismissive summary of Jaya Simha's reign is by the Persian translator; Joonaraja describes the last five years of his reign in good detail (RTJ, *sh.*, 27-38). The translator omits the defeat of the king of Gazni at the hands of Raaja Jaya Simha, described by Joonaraja in graphic detail with the commander of the Raaja putting his shoes on the king's pillow, instead of killing him, to warn him of the prowess of the Raaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 32-37).
2. RTJ, *sh.*, 39
3. This is incorrect. Joonaraaja says the king gathered 'imperishable wealth' (RTJ, *sh.*, 40).
4. Joonaraaja does not say so (RTJ, *sh.*, 39-41). It is the Persian translator's dilution on his own preceding, incorrect statement.
5. This again, is not a correct translation of the original account. Joonaraaja says (RTJ, *sh.*, 41): 'The wealth of the king was like that of a Brahmana who follows the injunctions of Vedas'.

exhausted most of his treasuries. He ruled for nine years, six months and ten days and passed away.

Raaja **Vanti Deeva**, son of Parmaanuk succeeded his father. His reign was seven years and two days.

Bapii Deeva [Boopa Deeva/**Vuppee Deeva**]¹ the son of Vantii Deeva was put on the throne to succeed his father, when after much effort nobody capable of ruling was found, as he did not possess the acumen to rule.² He was exceedingly foolish. One day, sailing by boat he saw his reflection in water.³ He laughed and when the laugh was seen in his reflection, he grew angry and struck at the reflection. His ring, thus, fell into the water. When he alighted from the boat, one of his intimates asked, "What happened to your ring?" He said, "It fell into water. I have drawn a line on the water to mark the spot so that my ring can be brought out."⁴ In idiocies of this sort he ruled for nine years, four months and seventeen days⁵ and passed away.⁶

Raaja *Jasa Deeva* [**Jassaka Deeva**],⁷ his younger brother, then sat on the throne with the consent of the lords. Though he did not want to assume the kingship the Loons, who were a very powerful clan, somehow put him on the throne. During his reign,

1. RTJ, sh., 50. Kaul reads it Vuppee Deeva (Kaul, Raajataranginii of Joonaraaja, page 53)
2. This is a totally incorrect. Joonaraaja does not say so. He says that finding no capable successor in direct line, the assembly chose Vuppee Deeva. He was not Vanti Deeva's son (RTJ, sh., 50).
3. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 96
4. This is a variant account of what Joonaraaja actually says (RTJ, sh., 53-54).
5. '...nine years, four months, two and a half days' (RTJ, sh., 55).
6. Critical observers would have been noted that these idiotic portrayals could not be true of kings ruling for long periods, passing their rules to their sons and enforcing a stable rule over the land. Joonaraaja may have not had many facts to report and recorded the folklore of the reigns which were two centuries anterior to him. Elsewhere, this writer has called these the shlookas of folly. They cannot be taken to be literal accounts of the period.
7. RTJ, sh., 56

two factious Brahmans, who were brothers, got employed and developed familiarity with Raaja. They became such a fixture there that they did many things on their own, without the knowledge of Raaja. Many evil acts were committed by them, which perturbed the Raaja. He set about turning them out.

After mutual counsel, the Brahmans resolved that since they had enough men, money and a high standing, Raaja could do them no harm. They decided not to approach anyone and reckoned none equal to themselves. With these corrupt thoughts ruling their heads, they aimed at the kingship. However, with the Loon clan favouring Raaja, their intents did not succeed.¹ Since Brahmans were rustics, it was impossible that kingship could devolve on them. Gradually they fell from grace and lost their stature. The king, thereafter, ruled with authority. His reign lasted eighteen years and thirteen days.

Raaja **Jagadeeva**, son of Jassaka Deeva, succeeded his father. Subjects prospered under his rule. He eliminated all oppressions of the old. He heavily punished the soldiers who fought amongst themselves and stopped the acts. Sometime later, the lords and ministers, out of avarice and wickedness, forced him out of the realm. One of the ministers, endowed with ability and acumen, sided with him.² After, they had gone some distance, he persuaded the Raaja to turn back.

Though he did not have enough men and materials to confront the opponents, he attacked them. People wondered at his straits and lack of wherewithal. Nevertheless he triumphed. His opponents were thrown off and took to flight, while he continued to rule as before. He ruled with justice and care. Though he held the kingship, he looked up to the minister for wisdom and way, in all affairs. Then, he gave ascendancy to an evil fellow of his own, named Padma, and made him the commander.³ Betraying

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 97](#)

2. Gunaraahula (RTJ, sh., 69).

3. Original says Padma was *dvaarpaala* (RTJ, sh. 74)

the king, he put poison in his plate and killed him.¹ He ruled for fourteen years and two months.²

Out of Padma's fear, his son, **Raaja Deeva**, took refuge in the Salhan fort. Padma besieged him. They fought for a long time. One day a trader brought fine footwear, embroidered in silver, as a gift to Padma. He became unwary and sat down to examine it. In a trice, a soldier came from behind and killed him.³ Those within the fort blew conches and beat drums in happy proclamation and put Raajadeeva on the throne. All ministers, supporting and opposing, submitted to him. He gave assurance to all and brought them round. The clan of Loons, who created much trouble, were soundly vanquished and made so obedient that thereafter they were made to haul grain to Srinagar, on their heads.⁴

Around that time, *Balaaddya Chand*, [Baladdhya Chandra]⁵ son of Mal Chandra, the king of Nagar Koott who had come to Kashmir in search of livelihood and had been given *jaagiir* in Laar, rebelled and occupied half of Srinagar. Since the Brahmans of Vyath found Raaja inattentive, and insulting to them, they held mutual consultations reckoning that since the king had been weakened and opponents were rising, it would be better to appoint another person in his place.⁶ Raaja hearing of it ordered for the Vyath clan

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 98
2. 'fourteen years, six months and three days...' (RTJ, sh., 75).
3. This is a variant translation of the original account given by Joonaraaja. It may be noted that the killing of Padma could not have been a chance event, as described here. The sequence of events tells that it was carefully planned, with soldiers ready to strike down Padma, at the opportune time.
4. The equitable king united the Lavaniyas and the chiefs like a family and distributed work/duties as before (RTJ, sh., 85).
5. RTJ, sh., 81
6. This is the reverse of the original account which says that the king, after overcoming Balaaddhya Chandra and taking full hold, became very strong. Brahmans, ignored by the powerful king, conspired to put a weakling on the throne (RTJ, sh., 83).

to be destroyed. When the army began its action, many of them¹ denied their lineage and claimed to belong to a different clan.

During the reign of Raaja an astronomer, named Majjalaacharaj [Vimalaacharya], authored a book on reckoning stars and titled it *adah maas bichhaar*.² The king founded two towns in Pargana Deevasara, one called Raajoorii [Raaja Purii] and the other Rajaloo [Raaja Looka].³ He expended much effort in adorning the towns. His reign lasted twenty-three years, three months and twenty-seven days.

Raaja **Sangraam Deeva**, son of Raaja Deeva, became the ruler after his father. He maintained the policy and authority of the preceding Raajas. His followers exceeded those of others. Affrighted, his opponents fled to remote nooks.

Out of affection, he relied upon his younger brother named Suuraj, who thereupon became an image of Raaja in pomp and status. When Suuraj gathered a large following, he set out to oppose the Raaja and rebell. On learning that the Raaja has heard of his betrayal, he fled away to Laar and took refuge with Baladdhya Chandra. Raaja attacked Suuraj and Chandra. They could not confront him and submitted. Tunga⁴, the lord of Shamaala, came to the help of Suuraj. He took him under his protection, and revered and respected him much. Coming to know of it, the Raaja charged with a huge force and destroyed the land of Tunga. Suuraaj was frightened and fled to a mountain pass.⁵ He would not spend two nights at one place. His associates deserted him, leaving him alone. He was caught and brought to the king. He ordered his limbs be torn and he be killed.⁶

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 99

2. Persian translation is incorrect. RTJ says that he corrected the extra-month error (*sh.*, 85).

3. RTJ, *sh.*, 86

4. The Persian translator (image 100) writes Tilak, here but later on gives the correct name Tunga. Tunga is the name in RTJ (*sh.*, 92)

5. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 100

6. Joonaraaja only says that the Raaja had him killed; he does speak of

Sometime later, scions of Kalhana¹ rose against the Raaja and destroyed many areas. The king was greatly dismayed at this development. He left Kashmir and went to his friend, the Raaja of Raajoorii, the wisest of person of the time, seeking his aid to extirpate the evil.

After the exit of Raaja, *Ddaangars* came to dominate, and unleashed oppression in the realm of Kashmir. People awaited the return of Raaja. Within a short time the Raaja returned from Raajoorii, attacked Kalhana-scions and subdued them. Despite his prowess, he did not consent to their slaying and pardoned each one of them.²

Poets and the learned got full promotion during his reign. The length of his rule was sixteen years and ten days.

Raaja **Raama Deeva** succeeded his father on the throne and killed his father's opponents. He appointed one of his intimates, Prithvii Raaj, as incharge of the affairs of the state. He built a fort on the bank of river Lyadar at Salar, which is known after him to this day.

Since the king had no issue, he adopted a Brahman boy, named Lachhman. He made him his heir, and died.³ His reign lasted twenty-one years, one month and thirteen days.⁴

tearing limbs (RTJ, *sh.*, 93).

1. The Persian text (image 101, line 3) has '*pisraani raaja* - Raaja's sons', with '*khwaish* - own' inserted above the words. It is actually scions of Kalhana (RTJ, *sh.*, 94). The Persian text too, calls them '*pisraani kalhana*' later (image 101, line 8).
2. Apparently, Joonaraaja has more definitive facts available now. The account of the very first kings of the 13th century CE, shows that the kingships were not held with any ease. The kings had to fight to hold sway; no nincompoop could survive there.
3. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 101
4. Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 112) gives the year as 49th (i.e. 4349 LE = 1273 CE).

Raaja Lachhmii Deeva succeeded Raaja Raama Deeva. Since, he was of Brahman lineage he could not bear the duties of kingship.¹

During his reign², a magician called Kajjal entered the kingdom and took away the properties of the people through charms and enchantment. He himself lamented and made others lament. He had come to Kashmir as a tourist. Though he had no army, he controlled the city. The Raaja ruled for thirteen years, three months and twelve days.

Raaja Simha Deeva, the master of Dachhan Paarrah, succeeded Lachhman Deeva.³ Sangraama Chand [Chandra]⁴ charged from Laar, and fought (Raaja Simha Deeva) at Srinagar. He was defeated and got killed. After the victory, Simha Deeva attained full control over the kingdom. He destroyed the outfit of Kajjal and turned him out of the city.

He took the discipleship of Shankaraachari [Shankar Svaamii]⁵, the foremost of the learned and obeyed every word of his. He built a huge well in village Marav for the wife of Shankaraachari, named Gavrii, the daughter of Brahman Parah, so that they did

1. The Persian translation is not correct. The original says: Even after having been turned a *kshatrii*, that Brahman king did not eschew his own *dharma* (RTJ, *sh.*, 114). Lakshmana Deeva and his sons ruled for a period longer than that of any of the seven dynasties of the so-called Delhi Sultante from 1206-1524 CE.
2. The translation omits the preceding *shlooka* telling that his queen constructed a Mattha (RTJ, *sh.*, 114).
3. The translation is inaccurate. Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 118) states that the commotion caused by Kajjal had reduced the king to being the master of Lyadarii, which is also called Dachhan Paarrah, being the right bank of river Lyadarii. Lachhman Deeva's adopted father, Raamadeeva had built a fort, Raam Koott there, whence his son Simha Deeva succeeded on his death (RTJ, *sh.*, 106, 116-117).
4. As mentioned elsewhere too, the actual name is Chandra, not 'Chand' to which the Persian translator reduces it (RTJ, *sh.*, 118).
5. RTJ, *sh.*, 123

not suffer on account of paucity of water.¹ He spent whatever money he had on that well.²

There was a custom in Kashmir that if a woman committed an indecency, officers imprisoned her father and took heavy fines from him. One day the king was listening to the singer Iddaagali. He enjoyed it much³ and said, "Ask of me, whatever you wish for." She said, "In this realm, there is a strange custom that fathers are punished for the sins of the daughter. Order it to be abolished." Raaja abolished the evil.⁴

Later, Raaja fell into the company of wicked and committed many indecent acts. The ministers and the lords went against him. Prior to them, a *sardaar* named Kaasiya [Kaama Suuha]⁵ rose and appointed an associate called Daryaa to kill the Raaja. Daryaa slayed him. The length of his reign was fourteen years, five months and twenty-seven days.⁶

Raaja **Suuha Deeva** became king after his brother. Though he was weak he established his rule, with the aid of Kaamasuuha who was very dear to him and whose object in killing Simha Deeva

1. This is a misreading of RTJ, *shlooka* 120-25, which describe the endowments of Simha Deeva, including his consecration of 18 *matthi*s in the name of his guru Shankar Svaamii (RTJ, *sh.*, 123).
2. This is again a misreading of RTJ, *sh.*, 122 saying that he bathed Shriivijeeshvara in milk bought for a lakh of gold coins.
3. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 102
4. This longish report is the 'translation' of the single *shlooka* 126 which says that, at the request of dancer Iddaagalii, the king revoked the orders to punish fathers for the deviant character of their daughters. The Persian translator expands it and invents even a dialogue between the 'singer' Iddaagalii and the king. Iddaagalii was actually a dancer (RTJ, *sh.*, 126). As an illustration of the digressive wont of the Persian chroniclers, it is a classical example.
5. RTJ, *sh.*, 128
6. Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 129) gives the year as 77 (i.e. 4377 LE = 1301 CE).

was to advance him.¹ Many people from the neighborhood of the realm of Kashmir went to Kashmir and took service with him.²

Shamsudiin son of Taahir, the scion of Kuras, the son of Neek whose liveage, as per the historians of Kashmir, reached the Paanddava Arjuna and the description of whose rule shall be duly recorded, came to Kashmir in response to a dream he had. He along with his men submitted to Raaja Suuha Deeva, who with due reverence said to him "You must take residence in this realm." He allotted a huge *jaagiir* to him and held him very dear.³

Around this time Dulachu, *miir bakshii* (paymaster-general) of the ruler of Kandahaar, heard that Kashmir has 60,000 villages.⁴ Thinking that he would grant a village to each of his soldiers, he set out with 60,000 cavalry to conquer the realm.⁵

Raaja Suuha Deeva imposed tax on the people to raise money to pay him off. People were unhappy at this exaction. Brahmans killed themselves and most people fled off to remote realms.⁶

1. Joonaraaja does not say any of these things which have been added by the Persian translator. He simply says that Suuha Deeva became king with the help of Kaamasuuha (RTJ, *sh.*, 130).
2. RTJ does not say they took service with the king. It says that they came to avail of the prosperity under his rule (RTJ, *sh.* 131).
3. This is not what the original says. RTJ (*sh.*, 141) only says: Since he came with his family, the king was pleased to grant him a stipend (*vritii*). There is no dialogue, no insistence, no endearment, in RTJ.
4. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 103.
5. This again is an incorrect rendering of Joonaraaja who says: "it was as if to conquer 60,000 villages that he had 60,000 cavalry in his force" (RTJ, *sh.*, 143). The Persian translator presents Joonaraaja's metaphor, as a plan of Dulacha. Joonaraaja does not anywhere associate him with the ruler of Kandahaar. It is all translators' own invention. Later Persian chroniclers repeat all these inaccuracies of as Joonaraaja's report, without verifying it from the original and without mentioning the Persian translation *intikhaabi taariikhi kashmiir*.
6. Joonaraaja's account, which is purportedly being translated, does not speak of people fleeing. Regarding Brahmans, RTJ (*sh.*, 145) says: the king (who was so sinful as to tax people).

About that very time, the people in Tibet fell out. The clan of Kaalsaamaanii [Kaalmanya]¹ rebelled and killed their ruler along with his whole family and none survived except a son called Rinchana, a man of sword and wisdom. Rinchana somehow escaped and after sometime brought the clan round. Next he went to the desert and buried arms under sand. Then he sent word to the murderers of his father that he was incapable of ruling and wanted to take employment with them. He obtained a promise from them for a meeting at the appointed spot and said, "Since I am unarmed, you too should not be armed."

Thinking the proposal opportune, they reached the appointed place. Rinchana, taking out the hidden arms, brought them down on the opponents. Despite this victory, he could not stay there because of the large number of enemies and came to Kashmir in fear.² He reached the village Neelah in *pargana* Laar and Raamchandra Nagarkoottii the ruler there, could not stand his attack³ and fled away.⁴

Coincidentally, Dulacha came from the west and began the massacre in Kashmir and Rinchana coming from south captured the rest of Kashmiris.⁵ Collecting huge monies from their sale, he

1. RTJ, *sh.*, 146
2. This again is a deviation from the original account, saying things not in Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 146-152).
3. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 104
4. This whole sentence is spurious. The original does not speak of any fight between Rinchana and Raamachandra, here (RTJ, *sh.*, 152). Joonaraaja does not say Rinchana came to Laar, much less give the name of the village the Persian translator lands him at.
5. Joonaraaja tells that the two - Dulacha and Rinchana - killed, captured and sold Kashmiris, using 'West' and 'South' as metaphors (RTJ, *sh.*, 155). The Persian translator confuses Joonaraaja's metaphors for actual directions. It must also be noted that Persian chroniclers have generally omitted to tell of the depredations by Rinchana, reported so explicitly by Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 156-58). They only report his bid to capture the throne.

left.¹ Kashmiris were subjected to great suffering, as described above. A famine broke out. Nothing save the green grass could be seen in the fields. Numerous people died of starvation, all over.²

When the chill increased, Dulachu could not stand it and returned to his realm by the Taarabal route.³ On hearing this Rinchana again came to Kashmir and reached pargana Laar with the intent to conquer Kashmir.⁴ Raamchandra closeted himself in the Laar fort.⁵ He fought the deceptions of men of Rinchana.⁶ On a pretext of selling *shaals* and woolens, and other Tibetan cloth Rinchana⁷ sent many of his men as traders into the fort. Raamchandar came near the men sent by Rinchana to purchase the cloth. They drew swords and finding him unwary, attacked and killed him. Rinchana captured the place. He wedded Kootta Deevii, the wife⁸ of Raamachandra and established his sway.

1. Joonaraaja only tells that Rinchana and his men captured Kashmiris and that Bwttas earned 'money like water' by selling them (RTJ, *sh.*, 158). Joonaraaja does not, anywhere, say that Rinchana left Kashmir.
2. There is no report of famine here, in Joonaraaja's original account (RTJ, *sh.*, 154-158). There is also no mention of Rinchana leaving (*loc. cit.*). The Persian translator is giving a confused reading of *sh.* 158.
3. It must be noted that Joonaraaja does not say Dulacha perished on his way out. It was added by the later Persian histories *Bah. Shaahi* (English tr. page 18), THMC (Persian text, page 48).
4. As mentioned in an earlier note, there is no mention of Rinchana leaving, in the original account nor of his return (RTJ, *sh.*, 154-62). Joonaraaja instead says that Rinchana became mighty by default as Dulacha took away the powerful and valiant of the land (RTJ, *sh.*, 163).
5. This has been added by Persian translator on his own. The original account does not say so. Joonaraaja clearly says that Raamachandra fought Rinchana, for the king, in the city (RTJ, *sh.*, 166). Later Persian historians gave currency to this interpolation. Some modern historians repeat these incorrect assertions (Suufii, *Kashiir*, vol I, page 68-69; Rafiiqi, HoK, page 20), though they have access to the original account.
6. The Persian text (MM, digital image 105) says Dulachu, but it must be a mistake as the account and effect, all relate to Rinchana.
7. Here too the Persian text has 'Dulachu' (MM, digital image 105).
8. The original account of Joonaraaja does not say 'wife' (RTJ, *sh.*, 169).

On learning of this Raaja Suuha Deeva, fled from the city and took refuge in Kohistaan (hills).¹ No news or action of his came thereafter. He died there. His reign lasted nineteen years, three months and twenty-six days.

When Raaja **Rinchana**, took over the rule², he gave up his wicked ways.³ Though he was not a Kashmiri, yet the Kashmiris respected him. He exercised benevolence and authority and eschewed the evil ways. Fearing his punishment the mischievous abstained from indecent acts. He himself dispensed justice and did not countenance any influence therein.

His justice was such that one day, Timah [Timi]⁴ the brother of his minister, felt thirsty and took milk from a milk-maid by force and drank it. She complained to the Raaja. The Raaja called the minister's brother and enquired of him. He denied. Raaja said to the woman, "If his belly be split and milk is not found there what should be done to you?" She said, "If that be not so, kill me and my son."⁵ So the king ordered that the minister's belly be split. From it, fresh milk which he drunk came out. People were pleased with this dispensation of justice, and praised Raaja's sense of equity.

Another of the cases which Raaja decided is that a lion ate one of the two foals of two mares, grazing in the hills. The case was brought to the king, with each person claiming that the foal belonged to his mare. Raaja asked one of his servitors to ride the mares in turn.⁶ The foal ran after each mare that was ridden. The owner of the other mare said that it was because the foal had been

1. This is as per the report of Joonaraaja, that the Raaja left the city only after his commander, Raamachandra, was killed (RTJ, *sh.*, 170-71).
2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 105](#)
3. The original account of Joonaraaja, translated into Persian here, does not anywhere say that Rinchana changed his ways (RTJ, *sh.*, 174-220).
4. RTJ, *sh.*, 181
5. Joonaraaja does not give this dialogue, invented by the Persian translator (RTJ, *sh.*, 181-184).
6. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 106](#)

suckled by both the mares and hence ran after both of them. When reason failed to resolve this issue, Raaja called for a boat and putting the mares with the foal in the boat, rowed away. When they reached some distance, he ordered the foal to be thrown into water. The mare which had birthed the foal at once jumped after it while the other mare remained where it was. Raaja gave the foal to the owner of the mare which had jumped into the water. All people present there were stunned at this solution. Numerous such tales are told of the Raaja.

Thereafter, the Raaja established his rule. Two commanders, one called Ttukka and the other Vyaala, had sided with Raaja in the Tibetan battle and displayed great valour, putting many enemies to death.¹ He made them his ministers. Towards the end, Raaja developed mistrust of Ttukka and entrusted the affairs of state to Vyaala. Everything that he did prevailed and was not overturned.

Raaja Suuha Deeva, before Dulachu's entering Kashmir had collected money and goods and sent² them as tribute to Dulacha through Udayana Deeva, one of his intimates. Udayana stayed in Qandahaar for some time but there was no meeting with Dulachu.³ Raaja's treasures remained as such with him.⁴ He thought of conquering Kashmir by dint of those treasures.⁵

1. Added by of the Persian translator, there is not even a hint of this in the original (RTJ, 194-203).
2. Another addition by the Persian translator, the original account does not anywhere speak of the tribute being sent, or Udayana Deeva going out to deliver it (RTJ, *sh.*, 144, 194-97).
3. The original does not speak of Udayana Deeva going out, or trying to meet, or not meeting Dulacha. RTJ (*sh.*, 197) saying 'Shriimaan, who was at Gaandhar, said to Ttukka...', would not mean the far away Qandhaar, but indicates a place within Kashmir, especially in view of the subsequent event of Udayana persuading Ttukka. (RTJ, *sh.*, 198-201).
4. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 107
5. This, again, is the translator's own invention; Joonaraja says nothing of this sort.

He sent a messenger to Ttukka who had been removed from the ministry with a letter¹ to this effect: "You and Vyaala equally served Raaja, yet Vyaala has become the prime minister, while you toiled. He has great enmity towards you and killed your brother on the pretext of milk. The proper course is that you and me should join forces and bring down the kingship."²

Reading Udayana Deeva's letter Ttukka collected a force and occupied one of the *mohalas* of Srinagar. He rebelled against the Raaja and fought with him, killed Vyaala who commanded full authority in the realm³ and after the victory entered the city to capture kingship. In utter foolishness, they did not know how it could be done, with Raaja still living. When Raaja saw the field was clear, he followed in the wake of Ttukka.⁴

Most of Ttukka's men took to looting. Others who remained fought one another and were killed all over. Ttukka took on the palace of Raaja with the few men he had. Raaja reached there with his army and ordered most of the enemies to be killed so that not a child of theirs was left alive. In that fighting a stone hit the Raaja

1. As mentioned in the preceding footnotes, the Persian translator is not translating but making up the account; it is not in the original. As per RTJ, Udayana Deeva spoke directly to Ttukka (*sh.*, 197).
2. The original account (RTJ, *sh.*, 198-201) does not make any mention of Udayana suggesting their joining forces. This is also borne out by the subsequent event of Ttukka going alone, i.e. with his own men (RTJ, *sh.*, 202). Likewise, Rinchana's vengeance is visited upon the Bwtas alone (RTJ, *sh.*, 209-11).
3. This too is not in the original account which actually speaks of Vyaala striking them with his sword (RTJ, *sh.*, 203).
4. The preceding is an incorrect version of the events given by Joonaraja (RTJ, *sh.*, 202-206). Joonaraaja says that they first attacked the Raaja. He fell down in a faint. They thought the Raaja was dead and proceeded to capture the city. Meanwhile Raaja came to and followed them to the city and confronted them there.

and he fainted. He again gained conscience and fought in that very state¹, and established his sway on the kingship.²

He made Shamsudiin, mentioned above, his confident and entrusted him with his child Chand born of Kootta Deevii.³ During those days he founded the town Rinchana Poor.⁴ When the season became very cold, the injury in his head pained him much. He lost his senses and passed away, due to that injury. His rule also ended.

Thereafter Raaja **Udayana Deeva** took over the rule. The details of this affair are that when the rule of Raaja Rinchana reached the end, he had an infant son, whom he entrusted to Shamsudiin. Koottaa Deevii endeavoured much for bringing up that child and kept Shamsudiin in good humour. She bestowed vantage goods and fine articles on Shamsudiin and also gave concession to his men, separately.

After the death of Raaja Rinchana, Shamsudiin thought: Raaja's son Chand is an infant and unable to rule; there are numerous enemies on all sides. The *Loon* clan, who were capable of ruling, had been uprooted by Raaja Rinchana and opposed

-
1. This, as mentioned afore, is an incorrect rendering of the original. It confuses Rinchana's vengeance, described clearly by Joonaraja (RTJ, *sh.*, 209-212) as a battle of sorts, and consequently leaves unintelligible bits all over. The original account is clear: while Vyaala confronted them, Raaja was injured during the attack and lost consciousness. When he came to, he found that attackers still there and feigned death. Ttukka and his men were deceived, left him there and went to loot the city. When Raaja saw the road clear, he stood up and went after them. Seeing him Ttukka and his men were thrown into disarray and Rinchana overcame them and then killed them in cold blood, with an exceeding barbarity (RTJ, *sh.*, 203-08).
 2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 108
 3. Name of Rinchana's son is clearly given in the manuscript as Chand (image 109, line 1) by the translator and not as Haidar, into which it was turned later. In fact, MM subsequently mentions the son 6 times (images 109-13) and all through it is Chand (=Chandar).
 4. The Persian translator has been confused. Joonaraaja actually says that Rinchana was so scared that he built a moat around his residence for safety (RTJ, *sh.*, 215).

him vehemently. Besides, entrusting government to them is not proper.¹ There upon, he sent a messenger to Udayana Deeva. He came from Kandahaar married Kootta Deevii and sat on the throne of Kashmir with the aid of Shamsudiin.²

Shamsudiin's sons, one named Jamsheera and the other Aleeshara, obtained power and were granted *jaagiirs* in pargana Kamraaj and outside. The management of the state affairs devolved on Kootta Deevii in his rule.³ The sect of Loons, who had been subdued, became prominent and created to conflicts and discord for some months. By Kootta Deevii's policy, they became obedient and submitted to the Raaja.⁴

Peace and order ensued all over the realm. No thieves or dacoits were left there. Though Udayana Deeva was the king, the power lay with Kootta Deevii.⁵ The king was given to worship and prayer. He was so benevolent that he distributed all his treasures among the needy. He was left with nothing save the crown on

1. It must be noted that all this is the Persian translator's own speculation; it is not found in the original record of Joonaraaja. The translator is making up the tale on his own, and not sticking to Joonaraaja's account, which he is translating (RTJ, *sh.*, 221-23).
2. As noted above, Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 221-23) does not speak of Udayana Deeva being out of Kashmir, or coming from outside, or being called in; *shlooka* 223 says that Kashmir along with Koottaa Deevii was handed over to Udayana Deeva, without any mention of Udayana Deeva being called from outside. Later Persian historians have made Koottaa Deevii to call in Udayana Deeva. All this is unfounded, as Joonaraaja does not even hint of it.
3. End of the digitalized manuscript ... *image* 109
4. Joonaraaja does not specify any role for Kootta Deevii, in this (RTJ, *sh.*, 228-29).
5. This apparently is the translation of RTJ *shlooka* 126 saying that 'Kootta held sway like mind and the king obeyed her like the body'. It, however, is not correct to see Udayana as a weakling. He had the support of *Lavaniyas*; he had brought about the end of Rinchana. The most signal fact is that Koottaa Deevii could not sustain on the throne for more than five months, while Udayana Deeva ruled for sixteen years. Joonaraaja makes it clear that he would have clipped Shahmiir's wings in the bud had not Koottaa prevented him (RTJ, *sh.*, 243-44).

his head and the bells he had tied on his horse so that the living beings would be warned and move away and not be harmed.¹

Around that time, a person called Achala, with the aid of Raaja of Magadpoor, set out with a large army to conquer Kashmir. As Dulachu had come, he too came with a force. Raaja Udayana Deeva, not able to confront him, fled towards Tibet. Cunningly, Kootta Deevii wrote a letter to Achala: "Raaja Udayana Deeva has left. The realm (i.e. the throne of the realm) is vacant. Since you too are a scion of the previous Raajas, you may rule the kingdom of Kashmir with support of all.² Send away the army of others, which you have brought for support, lest they bring destruction to the land."

Since Achal's end was near, he was led astray by these words and sent away his supporters.³ With the small force left with him, he entered Kashmir. Kootta Deevii ordered that every village and town, which Achala entered, should feast him.⁴ She sent him delicacies and fine robes and wondrous presents. Because of this feasting, he was late reaching the city and was delayed at all places, enroute.⁵

Thereafter Achala met the queen and requested her to grant him the kingship. The queen said, "I have suffered greatly. My husband has passed away and the young son I had too did not

1. The later part is a misreading of RTJ, *sh.*, 230 which says: he had ordered bells to be tied to horses so that creatures would get warned and not be trampled upon.
2. The later Persian historians (BS, VK, TH) have wrongly called this scion of Kashmir Raajas, a Turk, when it is clear that he was a local rebel supported by the Raaja of Mugadpoor.
3. Elsewhere, this author has argued that what later chroniclers call Udayana's fleeing, and most his cowardice, may actually have been a well-planned strategy to trap Achala and overcome him without spilling the blood of the royal family. Kootta's letter virtually spells it out (RL Bhat, *From Hindu Realm to Muslim Rule*, *in press*).
4. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 110](#)
5. This again is a very expansive dilation of the succinct report, of Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 235-37).

remain. Right now, I am in mourning. Once it is over, I'll do whatever be needed." Saying so, she raised a loud lament, and sat in mourning as per the customs of that realm. Taking to nook, she began to pray.¹ Secretly, she wrote a letter to her husband asking him to return with speed.

During the absence of Raaja, the queen Kootta Deevii appointed a person of Tibetan origin, named Khai Rinchana, to look after the affairs of the state.² Secretly joining him, she bore a son by him, named Jatta, and entrusted it to the care of the minister named Lakhman. The king learning of it did not deem its disclosure proper.³

When Raaja returned from Tibet, the queen interceded with the king for the said Khai-rinchana and said, "Had this person not been around, all my efforts would not have availed." The king became lenient, as a result. He captured Achala and put him in prison.⁴ Shamsudiin continued his duty of guardianship of Chandra, the son of Raaja Rinchana. Though Kootta Deevii had equal love for Chand and Jatt⁵, Shamsudiin did not favour Jatt.

1. It should be noted that all this, together with the dialogue, is an invention of the Persian translator. Joonaraaja's account does not say any of it (RTJ, sh., 235-39). Joonaraaja's account only says that once Achala was tricked and had sent his army away, Koottaa asked Udayana Deeva to return.
2. In the aforementioned work (Hindu realm to Muslim Rule) this author has opined that *khai rinchana* could have been a nick-name for Achala, who may well have occupied the throne after Koottaa's letter above, pending Udayana Deeva's return. One his return Udayana disposed him off as Joonaraaja reports (RTJ, sh., 241).
3. This too is an invention of the Persian translator without any basis in the original report (q.v.).
4. Joonaraaja does not again speak of Achala after telling of his being taking the bait (RTJ, sh., 239). The episode of Achala and Khai Rinchana appear as incongruous pieces in the narrative. So is Udayana imprisoning Achala, here. This is because Achala and *khai rinchana* have not been seen as the same person. Taking *khai rinchana* as the nick-name and kenning the 'fleeing' of Udayana as a strategem, all the bits in the apparently incongruous tale fit into a coherent narrative, as argued by this author elsewhere (Hindu Realm to Muslim Rule).
5. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 111](#)

Raaja Udayana Deeva grew close to Shamsudiin and took his advice in all affairs of the state.¹ Shamsudiin was so powerful that he did whatever he wanted.² If Raaja objected, he retorted, "You are the one who fled at the fear of Achala. Rule if you will, else I would put Chand³ on the throne right now."⁴

Meanwhile Aleeshvara, son of Shamsudiin, a young man in his prime, trained his men and gave them money. Using the pretext of unruliness, he penalized Raaja's men⁵, creating impressions of authority. Shamsudiin had two sons, by a different mother, one called Sarasaatak [Sharashaattaka⁶] and another Hindaal.⁷ They benefited the people much.

Raaja Udayana Deeva apprehensive of Shamsudiin and his sons ordered the gate-keepers not to let them enter the court.⁸

1. This and the preceding sentence are totally contrary to the original report of Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 244-46). Joonaraaja reports that the king did not trust Shahmeera. He clearly says that the Raaja was prevented from punishing Shahmeera by the queen's love for her first born, Chandra, who was in Shahmeera's custody (*sh.*, 244). He also speaks of Shahmeera's growing arrogance (*sh.*, 245) and his using the boy to blackmail the king Udayana Deeva (*sh.*, 246).
2. Joonaraaja does not say so, anywhere.
3. It must be noted that all through the translator calls the son of Raaja Rinchana 'Chand' which is his manner of writing 'Chandar'. The name 'Haidar' assigned to Rinchana's son by modern chroniclers is a later distortion and so is the title *Sultaan* for Rinchana. It all is a modern prevarication to 'prove' that Rinchana had converted to Islam. It is also worth nothing that this early Persian translator of the Sanskrit histories of Kashmir, including the crucial one of Joonaraaja, does not anywhere say so. Nor, of course, does Joonaraaja.
4. This again is an invention of the Persian translator; Joonaraaja does not say so, anywhere (RTJ, *sh.*, 246). Note the repeated mention 'Chand'.
5. This is a misreading of RTJ, *sh.*, 253, which says that he imposed tax (*jiziya*?) on the people of Karaala.
6. Given the absence of appropriate marks in the Persian script, the name given in text is same as that in Joonaraaja.
7. This assertion too does not accord with the original record. Joonaraaja clearly says they were Shahmeer's grandsons (RTJ, *sh.*, 248). The translator's 'by another mother' is also not in RTJ.
8. This is not in Joonaraaja. It could be a misreading of RTJ, *sh.*, 249, which says that Shahmiir became arrogant after he had given a daughter to

Shamsudiin, then, stopped going to the king's palace,¹ and brought the lords of that realm to his side. Some he caught in marriages, many he killed and made huge promises to their clans.² He enticed some with money and put them in prison and captured their realms.³ Raaja's minister Lakhan [Laksham]⁴ gave his daughter to Aleesheer and because of this Aleesheera gained much prestige.⁵

With all this, and since he held the son of Raaja Rinchana, the people saw Shamsudiin as wiser, braver and more influential and accepted him. With cunning Shamsudiin brought round the sect of Loons, who commanded great influence, without letting the clan realize that he was after their extirpation.⁶ Shamsudiin's group grew day by day till except Srinagar all came under his sway. Then the Raaja passed away. His reign was fifteen years, nine months and two days.⁷

dvaarpaal, which was a danger signal. Joonaraaja using *dvaara* as a pun has confused the translator.

1. This is not in Joonaraaja's account.
2. Joonaraaja has given details of persons with whom marriages were contracted, those who were bribed and those terrorized by Shahmeera (RTJ, *sh.*, 250-259).
3. This is a skimpy translation of RTJ, *sh.*, 258-59: 'the dissolute Lavaniyas were brought under by him - some with reconciliation, some with divisions caused within them, some with gifts and some through fear; the Lavaniyas bore his daughters like garlands around their necks, little realizing that they were snakes killing with deadly poison.'
4. Laksham was the *kampaneeshvara*, a local governor (RTJ, *sh.*, 256).
5. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 112
6. The Persian translator misconstrues the *shlooka* (RTJ, *sh.*, 259) saying that the Hindu lords did not realize that the daughters of Shahmiir, they wedded, were she-serpents round their necks, and would kill them. Strangely, the Persian translator does not mention that Shahmiir had married his and his sons' daughters to Hindu chiefs, as one of the means to capture them, which Joonaraaja mentions in detail, and is the basis of his comment above.
7. Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 263) gives the year as 14 i.e. 4414 LE (= 1339 CE). Here Joonaraaja does not give the period of the reign of Udayana Deeva. Translator has calculated it.

Kootta Deevii concealed the death of Raaja for four days, out of fear of Shamsudiin. She sent him a message to crown Chandar, the son of Raaja Rinchana, as king and himself be the minister.¹ Finally the clan of Loons intervened and put the queen on the throne.² Gathering the wise Brahmans and the common folks she (performed his last rites and) burnt Raaja's corpse.

Shamsudiin coming to know of it, remembered his cordiality and earlier vows and reconciled to her rule together with the ministers who could remove the queen. He was held in great respect by the queen and aided her in the affairs of the state.³ Inspite of the several services Shamsudiin had rendered the queen⁴, she mistrusted her and appointed two persons of the *Bahat* (Bhatta) clan, one Makhan [Bhikshana]⁵ and the second Avtaara as her ministers.⁶ Shamsudiin was much perturbed at this yet being diplomatic and astute did not show it.

1. The Persian translator reverses the original account which says that fearing that Shahmiir would capture the kingship through her son, Koottaa did not crown her elder son (RTJ, *sh.*, 265).
2. This too is contrary to the original account: Torn by the love of her sons, troubled by her advancing age and apprehensive of Shahmiir capturing her, Shrii Kootta, solicited the aid of *Loons* (Lavaniyas) with the plea of being a woman and an aborigine (RTJ, *sh.*, 267).
3. This again is contrary to the original report of Joonaraaja which says Kootta Deevii did not trust Shahmiir. Apprehensive of Shahmeera she concealed the news of Udayana Deeva's death (*sh.*, 264); afraid that Shahmeera would usurp the kingdom in the name of her first born, she abandoned her son (*sh.*, 265); she feared Shahmeera would imprison her (*sh.*, 266); Kootta Deevii did not trust Shahmeera fearing he would obstruct her rule (*sh.*, 270).
4. This is a wrong inference. Shahmiir had gained wealth and statue by dint of Shrii Koottaa and power by blackmailing her. Four (*sh.*, 264, 265, 266, 270) of the seven *shlookaas* of RTJ, dealing with this, speak of Shamsudiin/Shahmeera threatening Kootta Deevii and she thoroughly mistrusting him. Again, it was only after Shrii Kootta brought Loons and all other minister round, that Shahmeera submitted (RTJ, *sh.*, 268).
5. RTJ, *sh.*, 270
6. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 113](#)

Feeling [feigning] illness he did not go to the court for some time.¹ The queen sent the two ministers to his house to enquire after his health. He stood up from his bed and talked to them for some time, till he had rendered them unwary. When they were alone, he beckoned to his men who drew daggers and killed them.

Kootta Deevii tried to appease Shamsudiin and sent him the message: "I had sent them to enquire after your health. You must have seen some evil in them deserving death that you ordered their killing. All that has occurred was proper. Do not trouble yourself over it."² Though she said so outwardly, she was filled with rancor and wanted to imprison Shamsudiin but was restrained by the ministers.³ The queen brought prosperity to the people.

She gathered a large force and was in wait of the opportunity, till one day she passed an order in the affairs of the state and Shamsudiin [Kampaneeshvara]⁴ did not carry it out. Enraged the queen collected her army and attacked. Kampaneeshvara⁵ overcame her and sent her to prison. She was in prison for a long time.⁶ Kumaara Bhatta, her able and sagacious minister,

1. Joonaraaja clearly tells that Shahmeera feigned illness: 'aiming to deceive, the vily one feigned illness...' (RTJ, sh., 274). The Persian translator too implies the same in the lines following, yet he tops it with an incorrect word.
2. This is an invention of the Persian translator, which is totally contrary to the original report. Joonaraaja does not anywhere say so. Instead, RTJ, talks of the enraged queen wanting to imprison Shahmiir which, says Joonaraaja, she was quite capable of carrying out (RTJ, sh., 283).
3. Joonaraaja tells that the ministers blackmailed her into not acting against Shahmeera saying that he'd kill Chandar, her first-born (RTJ, sh., 282).
4. The Persian translation is incorrect. Joonaraaja clearly says that it was Kampaneeshvara who disobeyed her orders, where upon she attacked him (RTJ, sh., 285-86).
5. The Persian translator's writing Shamsudiin here and the preceding sentence is incorrect (RTJ, sh., 286). It is hard to say whether the Persian translator did so deliberately to give Shahamiir a greater role in the affairs or wrote the wrong name by mistake.
6. Given that her total rule lasted five months, 'a long time' ('mudatee' of the Persian translator) could not have been more than a few days.

played a trick¹ and freed her from the prison.² After exiting the prison, she went around gathered a force³ and did not in any way show gratefulness to Kumaara, who had worked to free her.⁴ Shamsudiin's campaign had so impinged upon her heart that she dared not fight him and remained lenient to him.⁵ She neglected fighting him and lost the kingdom.⁶ Shamsudiin gained sway. He was after the queen, so that he could capture her again⁷ and kill her.

The queen left Srinagar and went to Indar Koott.⁸ Shamsudiin came into the city⁹ and sent her the message: "If you want the kingdom and your son, accept me as your husband¹⁰, so that we can hold the kingdom and rule with justice. I'll do whatever you want and would not harm you."

1. How Kumaara Bhatta freed her from the prison of *Kampaneeshvara* is described by Joonaraaja over the next nine *shlookas* (RTJ, *sh.*, 287-95).
2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 114.
3. The translator omits the next part which says: and ere the guards could know of her escape she had beaten *Kampaneeshvara* (RTJ, *sh.*, 296).
4. This again is grossly contrary to the original report of Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 297) which says that the queen not only appreciated how the minister had overcome her enemies, but also lamented the loss of the other warrior (Bhikshana, killed earlier by Shahmeera).
5. The Persian translation is incorrect. The original says: Her not acting against him did not allay Shameera; wise men confronted with powerful never become lax (*sh.*, 297): she was neither happy nor enraged with that powerful one; hate accompanied by inertia is the first flower of destruction (*sh.*, 298).
6. It needs be noted that the chronicler who earlier gave Koottaa all credit for the power and authority of Udayana now shows her to be incapable and irresolute: it is ministers who are credited for her victories; she does not act against Shahmiir despite provocations. It also overlooks the fact that she was blackmailed into inaction, because of her love for her son Chandra, held by Shahmiir.
7. The word 'again' here is in context of the wrong translation above which writes Shahmiir instead of *Kampaneesh* (cf. *supra*).
8. This too is contrary to the original which says that she had gone there on an official errand: When she had gone to Jayaapiiddapur on some official errand, Shahmeera captured the city (RTJ, *sh.*, 300).
9. Joonaraaja says, he besieged the fort (RTJ, *sh.*, 302), and then sent her the command not message (RTJ, *sh.*, 303).
10. As per GMD Suufii, Shahmiir was 77 years old (*Kashiir*, Vol I, page 78).

Enticed by these words¹, the queen accepted Shamsudiin as her husband.² They cohabited for one night. When the morning dawned, Shamsudiin put the queen in prison.³ The queen ruled for four months and a half.⁴

Sultaan⁵ **Shamsudiin**, son of Taahir, then sat on the throne. Before becoming king his name was Shahmiir and after kingship he gave himself the title Shamsudiin. Fearing that the people may revolt⁶ in support of either of the queen's sons and put them on the throne, he imprisoned both brothers and appointed reliable guards⁷ over them to keep thorough watch.

His benevolence and bravery was proclaimed around. It fully assured the enemies except the sect of Loons, who were apprehensive of him.⁸

1. Joonaraaja gives no dialogue; it has been inserted by the Persian translator.
2. Joonaraaja does not speak of any marriage: it is a command to bed not wedding (RTJ, sh., 302-303). Was 'marriage' inserted to spare Shamsudiin the crime of 'zinaa' — rape in present day parlance?
3. It is worth noting that the Persian translation of Joonaraaja, did not speak of the queen committing suicide which tale was invented by later Persian historians (THMC, page..., BS....., TH.....)
4. Joonaraaja does not give the length of Koottaa Deevii's rule but only the date she was dethroned: '10th of the bright half of *shravana* of the 15th year' (RTJ, sh., 306). Translator apparently computed the period from Udayana Deeva's death (thirteen, the Shivaraatrii, of the 14th year, (RTJ, sh., 263). It is 4 whole months, and 10 days plus 2 fortnights and 2 days — a total of 5 months and 12 days. The translator has made a rough guess of the period.
5. Joonaraaja does not anywhere use this title for Shamsudiin, or any king for that matter.
6. While the fear of a public revolt would have weighed on Shahmiir's mind when he deposed the reigning queen and usurped the kingship, Joonaraaja does not speak of it in his original report of Shahmiir imprisoning queen and her sons (RTJ, sh., 307).
7. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 115
8. This is also incorrect. Queen Kootta took refuge in the fort when she found that Lavaniyas had gone over to Shahmeera and obeyed him (RTJ, sh., 301).

He abolished all the oppressions and cruelties, dating back to the previous raajaas.¹ He rehabilitated the whole realm of Kashmir, left desolate by the loot and repine of Dulachu.² He abolished the evil levies and ordered that more than a sixth should not be taken as tribute (revenue) from anyone. For a long time this continued to be the rule for the officers and enforcers in Kashmir. He used to personally investigate and resolve the cases which the wise ones could not settle.³

When his rule had steadied and the enemies been overcome, he summoned the learned and taking oaths from the queen and her two sons, released them from prison and allotted them huge *jaagiirs*.⁴

The group of Loon *sardaars*, who fearing him had fled to Kishtvaar, was brought back by the people of that realm in deference to the Sultaan.⁵ He appointed some, who possessed administrative ability, he to offices. Most of them, he fined and confiscated their properties and dealt with each as he wished.⁶ He so conducted the affairs of the state as if kingship had been in his house since ancient times.⁷ Entrusting all affairs of the state to his

-
1. This is the addition of the Persian translator. Joonaraaja does not anywhere so that he changed the laws of regulations. Rafiqi also says that Shahmiir made no changes in the administration or laws (HoK, *ibid.*, page 23).
 2. The original account does not anywhere say this in the description of Shahmiir's rule (RTJ, sh. 307-15).
 3. All this is translator's invention and goes contrary to the original which says that he devolved the state affairs to his two sons and give himself up to enjoyments of kingship (RTJ, sh., 314).
 4. There is absolutely no such intimation in the original account of Joonaraaja describing his rule and death (RTJ, sh., 307-15).
 5. This, again, is not only incorrect, but contrary to the original account. Joonaraaja tells: The Raaja chased the *raajasthaaniis* (not Loons), who had fled to Kaashthvaar, out of that place (RTJ, sh., 313).
 6. These too, like the other details are the translator's own inventions, not found in the original account of Joonaraaja.
 7. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... image 116

sons Jamsheera and Aleesheera, he gave himself up to luxury and enjoyments, and passed away. His reign lasted three years.¹

Sultaan Jamshara, son of Shamsudiin, succeeded his father with the aid of the state officers. His younger brother, Aleesheer, who was wise and brave, endeavored to be a parallel to Jamshara. In his etiquette, dispensations and dealings, he presented himself as an equal of his brother. Jamshara was afraid, lest the people should rise and put him on the throne. Their respective men fought all over trying to destroy the rival party. Then several of Jamshara's soldiers rebelled and went over to Aleesheer.² Jamshar asked him to send them back. He did not comply.³ He exited from the city and went to Avantiipoor, a city famous since ancient times. Jamshar chased him with a huge force. When he reached Kaakapoora, he wrote Aleesheer a letter of reconciliation saying: A group of miscreants has infiltrated amongst us and brought about this situation. Else, what indecent act have I committed that you detest me? Our father had advised each of us that we should remain united and not leave each other's side. What is the reason that you do not act as per father's advice? Why don't you realize that people would be laughing at us that you rebel against me at the instigation of enemies?"

Meanwhile, Jamshar heard that one of the earlier *sarddaars* (lords) has rebelled in Deevasarah and sent his son with a large force to subdue him.⁴

Hearing of this, Aleesheer apprehended that the force would attack him⁵ and went away from Avantiipoor on the pretext of

1. 'Three years and five days' says Joonaraaja (*sh.*, 315).
2. This is not what the original says. Joonaraaja says that Aleeshvara was influenced by his intimates (RTJ, *sh.*, 319).
3. This is not in the original account, which says the *raajasthaaniis* befriended him (*sh.*, 320) and that he fled to their stronghold Avanti Nagara (*sh.*, 321).
4. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image](#) 117
5. This is contrary to the original record which says that Aleeshvara dodged the king's messenger and went to attack his son, sent on Deevasarah campaign (RTJ, *sh.*, 326).

hunting. He imprisoned¹ the messenger of Jamsheer and taking lead set out to kill Jamsheer's son.

Jamsheer's minister, Lakhman, learning of this circumstance through his sagacity, went to Jamsheer and said, "It appears to me your son's going to after old *sardaar* would have given Aliisheer an excuse and he has gone to fight your force. They are holding the messenger back with excuses, which is why his return has been delayed. If you agree, we'll go to Vantiipuur, which is vacant now, and do away with Aliisheer's army which would be small and destroy their arms and supplies. Thereafter, we shall go after Aliisheer and subdue him." Jamsheer agreeing with this opinion set out for Vantiipuur. Aliisheer's men hearing of this fought Jamsheer fiercely and got killed in countless numbers.

Meanwhile, Aliisheer returned after defeating Jamsheer's son. When Jamsheer heard of this return, he fled away. Two months later, Aliisheer sent away most of his army² with a small force he went through Charaat [Kshiirii] to Achha [Ikshakaa]³ and stayed there.

Entrusting the protection of the Srinagar city to *Saraaj* [Sathyaraaja]⁴, Jamsheer⁵ himself went to Kamraaj with his army. Suduukar, who was one of the patricians, frightened Sathyaraaja and said, "Since Jamsheer has left for Kamraaj you are alone. A great bounty is expected from Aleesheer. You'd better ally with Aliisher."⁶ Led by Suduu, Sathyaraaja handed over Srinagar to

1. The translation is incorrect. The original report says that the messenger was held back with excuses, not imprisoned (RTJ, *sh.*, 326).
2. Here the Persian translator has omitted a *shlooka* of the original (RTJ, *sh.*, 334), which says that prior to this Aliisheer sued for peace and non-combat 'for two months'. This has confused the translator.
3. The original says "leaving Avantii Nagra he went through *Kshiirii* route to *Ikshikaa*" (RTJ, *sh.*, 335).
4. RTJ, *sh.*, 336: Later Persian chroniclers have transformed this distortion of Sathyaraaj into Siraajuldiin (VK, TH).
5. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image](#) 118
6. This is an invention of the Persian translator. There is no mention of Suduukar, or anybody else, enticing or frightening Sathyaraaja, in the

Aliisheer. Later Jamsheer was ever in lament over this event. He ruled for one year and two months.

Sultaan Alaavudiin, son of Shamsudiin, who was earlier known as Aliisheer, then succeeded to the throne and adopted the title Alaavudiin. Out of fear of foes and their objections, he made his younger brother¹ Sarshataashap [Sharshaattaka]² the royal porter.³

Mobilizing all resources, Jamsheer built a bridge on the river Vyath in the Sooyapoor region, with the objective of entering the city and killing Aliisheer.⁴ That did not happen and Allavudiin continued on the throne.⁵ He ruled with benevolence and justice. Under his reign people were freed from oppression and could quickly access the court. There were low prices and plenty of goods in the realm.

There was a custom in Kashmir that a woman, whose husband was dead, could claim share in her husband's estate, even if she were of loose morals. In Sultaan Alaavudiin's reign, that custom

original account (RTJ, *sh.*, 336-37).

1. Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 248) has expressly stated that Sharshaattaka and Hindaal were Shahmiir's grandsons and accordingly Alaavudiin's sons.
2. RTJ, *sh.*, 342
3. The Persian translator appears to have confused two distinct *shlookas* in the original. RTJ, *sh.*, 339, which does not give any name, says: "not deeming the time opportune for battle, Alaavudiin, gave the post of *dvaareeshvar* (Lord of the gate) to his brother." The brother, here, would mean Jyamsheer. RTJ *shlooka* 342, coming after the death of Jyamsheer, talks of Sharshaattaaka getting the position of *dvaareeshvara*. It may also be pointed out that the translator's Persian word '*haajib*' meaning the post of porter within the royal palace is not same as *dvaareeshvara*. The translator is fitting the posts or positions in the Mugal house to the court positions in Kashmir, three centuries back.
4. There is no mention of this 'objective' in the original, which says the bridge was for public (RTJ, *sh.*, 340)
5. Here and in the preceding statement, the Persian translator has misconstrued *shlooka* 240 which says that though Jamsheera removed the hardship of people (with the bridge) he could not remedy his own hardship (of having been deposed).

was abolished and women of loose morals were deprived of the share in their dead husband's estates.

During his reign, the sect of *zastarii* [Raajas-thaaniis] who had left Kashmir and gone to Kashtvaar and always resisted the king, was diplomatically brought back by him¹ and put in prison.² Everyone who tended to resist or rebel was done away with.³

He built grand palaces in Indarkoot and founded a city after his own name at Rinchana Poor.⁴ A terrible famine broke out in the realm towards the end⁵ of his reign and countless people perished. His reign lasted twelve years, six months and thirteen days.⁶

Sultaan⁷ **Shahaabudiin**, son of Shamsudiin, who was named Sharshaattaka, succeeded his elder brother to the throne⁸ and got named Shahaabudiin. He was very kind. There remained no place

-
1. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 119](#)
 2. This is a spurious addition, not found in the original. Aliisheer had gained power with the aid of Raajasthaaniis (RTJ, *sh.*, 320-21), whom his father had chased out (RTJ, *sh.*, 313).
 3. There is no mention of this in the original (RTJ, *sh.*, 338-359). Aleeshvara had himself allied with the rebellious Raajasthaaniis and captured the rule.
 4. This is a misreading of the explicit RTJ, *sh.*, 357 which says: Making Jayaapiidapuur his capital, the wise one built a monument, dedicated to Chakra Buddha, called Budhgira, at Rinchana Pura. There is no mention of building palaces, which the translator adds on his own.
 5. The Persian translator misreads the original. Though *shlooka* 358, speaking of the famine, is the penultimate *shlooka* describing his reign, it explicitly states that the famine occurred in the 19th year, which was the first year of Alaavudiin's reign. The next *shlooka* says he died in the 30th year.
 6. Joonaraaja's original says 12 years and 8 months (RTJ, *sh.*, 359).
 7. Joonaraaja does not call any of the kings '*Sultaan*' using the title '*Ragya*' (Raajaa) for all.
 8. Joonaraaja has clearly stated that Sharashaattaka and Hindaala were Shahmeera's grandsons (RTJ, *sh.*, 248). The translator has confused himself over the ambivalent *shlookas* 339 and 342 and called him Alaavudiin's brother. Persian historian Farishta follows this wrong lead.

which he did not conquer. Under his rule which was of peace and benevolence, the people forgot the benevolence of the earlier Raajas, which has been exemplary.

He was saddened, when he did not receive news of a conquest. He did not count that day in his life. He was in full sync with his soldiers and personally organized their campaigns. Every county he conquered, he devolved back to the previous masters. With his might and fury, he conquered the lands not subdued by the previous Raajas. He put numerous opponents to sword.

He chose three commanders named Lavdaar [Lavlak], Chandaar [Chandra] and Shoodaar [Shuura]¹, as his deputies and sent them to all places dominated by *ganiim* [looters]. The three overcame them and made people submit to the king.

Sometime later, the king setting out on conquest² reached the bank of river Sindh in the vicinity of the city Udbaanddpuur. Goovind Khaan, the ruler of the place fought a furious battle with Sultaan. Finally, he lost. Sultaan chased him. Khaan was greatly distressed and sent his son Hasan Khaan's daughter as present to Sultaan. It is said that thereafter Sultaan captured Kandahaar.³ The

1. There are the original names (RTJ, *sh.*, 370). The Persian translator has confounded Joonaraaja's original account telling that king had appointed the first two commanders and the third a minister.
2. End of the digitalized manuscript, ... [image 120](#)
3. The actual Persian sentence is very revealing: "*baadi azaan Sultaan Vyalaayati Kandahaar raa, ki Qandahar buudah baashad, mutasraf gasht*" – thereafter the Sultaan captured Kandahaar, which must be Qandahaar.' Clearly the writer is reading from a Persian text, where the name has been written with a '*kiif*' instead of '*qaaf*'. We know from Abu Fazl that Akbar had entrusted Shah Muhammad to translate the Sanskrit histories of Kashmir. (Aini Akbari, Abu Fazl Vol I, English translation, H Blochman, page 112). Subsequently Abu Fazl says that the translation being too archaic, Badaayyunii was tasked to prepare a short recession, which he did in two months (Aini Akbari, English tr. Vol. II, pages 357-76). Badaayyunii in his *mantakhabul tavaqriikh* records that he completed the said intikhaab in 999 HE (MT, Vol II, page 318). The present work is the simpler version produced by Badaayyunii. He being unfamiliar with Kashmir – he never visited it – has committed many errors. However, the indication in the very opening (image 12) that it was completed in

opponents could not face him. Gazniin, the seat of famous sultans since ancient times, was so shaken hearing of his splendor and glory that the rulers of that realm fled away without even a fight.

Then, Sulnaan's soldiers reached the realm of Tarah, fought fiercely, and killed their opponents. There from, Sulnaan went to Aashat Nagar [Ashttanagar]¹ and laid it waste. Thereafter, the city came to be known as Peeshaavar.²

From the place, he reached the Hindu Kush [Hindu Ghoosha]³ mountain, after suffering greatly. The whole army suffered in this endeavour.⁴ Forced to retreat from thence, they laid camp on the bank of river Satluj [Shatdru]⁵ and refreshed themselves. There, the men forgot their travails.

Meanwhile, Raaja of Nagarkoott, called Shitrim, had gone to conquer the realm of Dehlii and returned with much loot. When he heard of the arrival of Sulnaan, he was struck with fear. Submitting to the Sulnaan, he presented all the fine things he

the reign of Jahaangiir is intriguing.

1. RTJ, *sh.*, 378
2. The Persian translator has misread the original, which says: ...thereafter, the name of the realm called *Purushaviir* (i.e. land of Valiant men) became meaningless (RTJ, *sh.*, 379).
3. Here, Joonaraaja, clearly records the original name of the famous mountain, as Hindu Ghoosha (RTJ, *sh.*, 381). The actual name 'Hindu Ghoosha' of the mountain has got distorted in Persian. It may have happened either due to the Persian script not distinguishing *kiif* and *gaaf* in writing, or to a misreading the Sanskrit word '*ghoosh*' as '*kush*' as that is the only near word, which would be intelligible to a Persian-speaking writer. This incorrect reading of Hindu *Ghoosh* (Hindu proclamation) as Hindu *Kush* (Hindu killing) is not a simple distortion but a travesty of the original nomenclature. The information from this earliest record demands that the original name - Hindu Ghoosha - of the mountain be restored.
4. Joonaraaja says: They turned back from the Hindu Ghoosha Mountain due to their horses getting strung, and ... (RTJ, *sh.*, 382)
5. RTJ, *sh.*, 382

had obtained there from to the Sultaan and stood before him in obedience¹ served him.²

Sometime later, the realm of Keedaar, and other places come to be included in the kingdom of Sultaan.³

He appointed a huge army to conquer Tibet. The ruler of Tibet came with various presents and countless offering, fell at Sultaan's feet and accepted his lordship. On account of this submission, humility and amity, Sultaan restrained the army from entering Tibet. Thereafter, he always remained on tour and travel and conquered remote realms with policy without fighting. Then he returned to Kashmir.

Citizens celebrated his return. Sultaan appointed his younger brother, *Hindaar* [Hindaal], his heir. In that very year, it rained heavily and due to floods most of the houses and farms were submerged.⁴ All houses in Srinagar were destroyed. So huge was the flood that people had no refuge except high mountains and nothing was visible, save water. Sultaan too climbed up the mount in fear. The circumstances left a deep impact on him. When the flood receded, fearing lest such a situation should arise again,

-
1. This is a misreading of the events described by Joonaraaja in *shlookas* 383-385. Joonaraaja does not say 'Raaja of Nagarkoot', but 'Udak-Patii', i.e. king of North; nor is the name 'Shitrim' in the original report. Joonaraaja says that raaja obstructed *Udak patii*, who surrendered his loot to him and that Shahaabudiin sent all the captured people to their places, with gifts to spread his good name. This indicates that *Udak patii* was not the ruler of Nagarkoott but a Central Asian invader (RTJ, *sh.*, 383-84).
 2. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 121
 3. There is no mention of Keedaar in the original.
 4. Joonaraaja gives the year of the flood as the 36th year of the local calendar equivalent to 1360 CE (RTJ, *sh.*, 405). He however, does not give the year of the aforementioned campaign against Bwtta Deesha (RTJ, *sh.*, 387). It is therefore difficult to say how the Persian translator says 'the same year'.

he built a city at the feet of Kohi Maaraan [Parbat]¹ and named it Lachham Nagar.²

He built another city called Shahaabudiin Puur, after his own name, at the place where the waters of Sindh and Vyath join.³ During the reign of the Sultaan, *Lool Daar* [Lavlak], who was one of the lords, built a city called Loolpuur in Baangil, with sparkling surface and high domes.⁴

Sultaan had two women⁵ in his wedlock, one elder called *Lachhmi* [Lakshmii], who had borne Sultaan a few children, and one younger, called Laasaa, with whom he was in full love.⁶ Laasaa envious of her co-wife and her sons always complained to the king and showed her in bad light. Lakshmii too had committed some acts, which had brought her Sultaan's abhorrence.⁷

-
1. The name given in the original account is Parbat (RTJ, *sh.*, 409), the name by which the hill is still known among Kashmiris. Why the translator has changed the name is not clear: *Kohi Maaraan*, meaning 'the hill of serpents' is not a word translation of 'Haari Parbat' or 'Shaarika Parbat', the Hill of Goddess Shaarika.
 2. RTJ, *sh.*, 410 tells that the city was named Lakshmi Nagar, after his chief queen Lakshmii.
 3. It is unthinkable that a place as conspicuous as the confluence of Sind and Vitasta would not have borne a name. Even before Shahaabudiin, it was a place of great prominence, famous as *prayaag*, the equivalent of Prayaag or Vaaraanasii. The place has an exceeding religious sanctity. To this day, Hindus immerse the ashes of the dead, here. Shahaabudiin may have built palaces at this famous place.
 4. Joonaraaja, however, does not say that it was in Baangil. His implication is that this 'Puri' too was near that of the king (RTJ, *sh.*, 412).
 5. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 122
 6. This is a misreporting of the original account. Laasaa was Lakshmii's sister's daughter, whom Lakshmii had brought up in the royal palace (RTJ, *sh.*, 414). Lakshmii may well have suckled her, as she had grown up along with her sons. When Laasaa's youth bloomed, Shahaabudiin lusted after her (RTJ, *sh.*, 415). Joonaraaja does not anywhere state that Shahaabudiin was wedded to Laasaa, though he clearly indicates their being paramours.
 7. This is the Persian translator's own invention and has no basis in the original account (RTJ, 414-21).

Out of the high passion which he bore for Laasaa, he promised everything to assuage her and believing her words, deemed Lakshmii's sons his enemies and threw them out. Since the sons of Sultaan were valiant, wise and tactful, their gallantry did not allow them to stay in Kashmir. They went to the ruler in Dehlii, called Hindu Khaan, who was subservient to the king and granted them *jaagiirs*.¹ Around that time the neo-convert² Sikandar had rebelled. The Paadashah of Dehlii³ ordered the sons of Sultaan to go to Sikandar, beguile him and cunningly kill him. They did it with credit and attained prestige, there.

The Sultaan was much engaged during the time.⁴ One day he went for hunting towards *Karjahaak Nagrii* [Kaddga Nagrii], over the bridge on Niilaab, with just a few men, when a lion attacked him.⁵ The Sultaan, separated from his army, confronted it single-handedly. Except Madan *Laavii* [Laavik]⁶, the servant from

1. The sentence is muddled. The original says: on her instigation, for her love, he banished the princes like aliens (RTJ, *sh.*, 440); they displayed their worth, aiding the lord of Yooginii pur (i.e. Dili) with their superhuman feats (*sh.*, 441). There is no mention of any Hindu Khaan or any *jaagiir* being granted to them in the original account.
2. This is a contrived and incorrect translation of RTJ, *sh.*, 442 which says: (Shahaabudiin) killed the treasonous *mleechihas* led by Sikandra, whom he had earlier given stipends on the recommendation of Hindu Khaana. There is no mention, in the original account, of their being converts. There is no mention of the sons of king, or the king of Dilli being involved in the episode.
3. As is clear from preceding note, the original report tells that the event occurred in Kashmir. It was led by Shahaabudiin himself. The Persian translator is simply incorrect. There is no mention of the king's sons being involved in the episode. Indeed, the sons of Shahaabudiin are not talked of again till the end, when the king nearing his death re-calls them (RTJ, *sh.*, 461).
4. This is not stated anywhere in the original. However, after describing the killing of treasonous Sikandara and before the encounter with lion, Joonaraaja speaks of the king tearing away the boat bridge on Sindhu to the north (RTJ, *sh.*, 444).
5. The Persian translator has misread or been misled. Joonaraaja says: 'touring Kaddga Nagrii for hunt he chased a lion'. There is no mention of Niilaab there, or of any other river (RTJ, *sh.*, 445).
6. RTJ, *sh.*, 443, 445-50; Joonaraaja, however, doesn't say that Madana Laavika was from Deeva Sarah.

pargana Deevasarah, none of the captains of the army was with him. When the lion attacked, Sultaan dismounted and took on the lion who, turning upon him, charged and pinned Sultaan down.¹ At the moment, Madan Laavika, alighted from his horse and took on the lion. He killed the lion with his dagger and freed Sultaan from mortal danger. Sultaan, who earlier was angry with him due to mistrust of his policy, was on account of his service ashamed of having sought to harm or threaten him.²

Daily, he sought his affection and instruction and raised him to the status of minister, and chastised the people who had spoken ill of him before.³ Since other lords and ministers became very jealous of him, Sultaan gave Madan Laavika enough money for his needs and sent him to Naak Puur, one of cities of Hind, on the pretext of bringing a suitable girl for the king to wed.⁴ He also commended him greatly to the Raaja of Naak Puur and gave him double the money which he had given to Madan Laavika. Much though Madan Laavika, opportuned for returning from Naak Puur, he answered, "Your staying there a little more is proper. The moment the Lords and ministers become amenable to you, I shall

-
1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 123
 2. The original account given by Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 443-50) is succinct and contexted with the affairs of Madana Laavika: wicked people created suspicion against Madana Laavika and, believing him ready to rebel, the Raaja turned him out of his service (*sh.*, 443). Then, a lion attacked the king on a hunt and Madana, risking his own life, saved the king (*sh.*, 444-48). The king then sent Madana to Ddillii Patii (king of Ddillii) on the pretext of arranging his (king's) marriage (*sh.*, 449-50). That is all the original says. The rest, including the tale that follows has been added by the Persian translator.
 3. With his interpolations, the Persian translator has reversed the purport of the original account. The original says that the king's mistrust of Madana, caused by the mischievous men, was cleared by the lion-event. The Persian translation says that the jealousy arose after the lion-event as the king began to favour Madana for having saved his life, at which others became jealous of him.
 4. The original, in a cryptic single-mention, says Ddillii-patii (i.e. king of Ddillii (RTJ, *sh.*, 450)) not Raaja of Naak Puur.

myself call you back.”¹ Meanwhile, Sultaan Shahaabudiin reached the end of his life and the issue (of return) went out of his hand.

On the basis of a dream, which one of his intimates² had and the Sultaan interpreting it as his own death³, he gave away all his monies and possessions to the poor and needy.⁴ Since he reckoned he had a short time left, he hurriedly summoned his sons from Dehlii. Before their arrival, he died, three days after that dream.⁵ His reign was twenty years.

Sultaan Kutubudiin, son of Shamsudiin, who was first called *Hindaar* [Hindu Khaan]⁶, succeeded his brother to the throne and promulgated his authority. He was unparalleled in truth, purity, valour and generosity and acted with etiquette and temperance. The surrounding Raajas were subdued by him. He was peerless in justice and benevolence.⁷

After he had established himself on the throne, some of the commanders whom Sultaan Shahaabudiin had left in Loohar Koott, and had enforced their hold there, lost their sway.

-
1. As mentioned above the preceding details and this dialogue are interpolations of the Persian translator, not found in the original account.
 2. It was Sharkar Suha, the Brahman preist. He dreamt of city of Gandarvas wherein he was told that the king was a *gandharva*, on some kind of deputation to Kashmir and was due to return to his abode soon (RTJ, *sh.*, 451-59).
 3. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 124
 4. *Intiikhaabi Taariiki Kashmiir*, it may be pointed out, is only the Persian translation of the Sanskrit histories of Kashmir, not a Persian history of Kashmir. The writer is not writing a history, like say Sayyid Alii, or Haidar Malik, but only translating; whatever he writes gets attributed to the original. This sentence, and many others too, which are not there in the original, are thus spurious.
 5. The original account does not say ‘three days after the dream’; it gives no time (RTJ, *sh.*, 463).
 6. Hereafter Joonaraaja refers to him as ‘Kudadeena’ (RTJ, *sh.*, 462); he does not call him ‘Kutubudiin’ the name used by the Persian translator and other Persian historians.
 7. These laudations are not in the original, which says he had a middling sway (RTJ, *sh.*, 464-65).

Landlords¹ of Loohar Koott overcame them. Sultaan Kutubudiin appointed *Loodar* [Lavlaka]² to that area. The Landlords took refuge in the fort. Lavlaka besieged them. The people within the fort sent messengers to him and said, "We'll handover the fort to you without battle. There is no need for this ferocity." He killed the messengers taking them to be spies. This did not help in resolution of the affair. Thereupon the besieged, losing all hope of life, came out in one body and charged upon Lavlaka and his men raining arrows and pelting stones. He too fought valiantly till he was killed with a stone.³

As mentioned above, Sultaan Shahaabudiin having learnt of his death through the dream of his intimate, had summoned his sons from Dehlii, but died before their arrival. Around the time Sultaan Kutubudiin became the successor, Shahaabudiin's elder son, Hasan, after reading his father's letter, had reached Chanpoo [Madra]⁴, when he heard of his father's death. He wished to perform the last rites and again return to Dehlii. At this time, he received a letter from Sultaan Kutubudiin saying that Sultaan Shahaabudiin has passed away. Hasan, coming to know of the subject of the letter⁵ went from Jammu to Kashmir and met the king.⁶

Selfish people said to the king: "Hasan is a swordsman. He is the heir to the throne. His (Shahaabudiin's) summoning him was not proper. Though he has come, he shouldn't be allowed to go back." Some others too talked in the same vein till Sultaan agreed to imprison Hasan. Before he could order his imprisonment,

-
1. The original record says Loohar Raaja, the king of the area (RTJ, *sh.*, 466-67).
 2. RTJ, *sh.*, 468
 3. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 125
 4. RTJ, *sh.*, 478
 5. As per the original, the letter (RTJ, *sh.*, 484-93), *inter alia*, invited Hasan and offered the post of heir apparent to him (RTJ, *sh.*, 485).
 6. This English translation, aiming to fully reproduce the Persian text, includes the repetitions, redundancies and what may be called inanities, to take readers closer to the text and its import.

Udiiraaval [Udaya Shrii]¹ who wholeheartedly supported Hasan, informed Hasan of this development and made him flee putting himself in prison instead. Even in prison, Udayashrii remained in good contact with Hasan and sent him messages. Though his intimates pressed him to punish Udaya Shrii, yet Sultaan out of his exceeding generosity and appreciating Udaya Shrii's intimacy with Hasan² was ashamed at killing him. On the intercession of queen Sura, wedded to Sultaan, he refrained from the sin of killing Udaya Shrii and freed him from prison. However, he (Udaya Shrii) remained devoted to Hasan's advance.³

Thereafter, Hasan fled from Kashmir. Taking aid of his old loyalists, who were in Budiil, he went to the fort of Loohar Koott.⁴ The occupants of the fort, who had rebelled against the Sultaan after killing Lavlaka gained strength. Hasan mobilized a force and waged war. Meanwhile, Udaya Shrii set out from Kashmir for Loohar Koott, but eschewing the straight route he went through Maroo.⁵

Taking the ruler of Maroo, named Kankaraaja, who was the father of Udaya Shrii's wife, to be on his side, he told him the truth and, asked Kankaraaj for aid and an escort to take him to Loohar Koott. Kankaraaj, getting in league with Sultaan, arrested Udaya Shrii and sent him to Sultaan.⁶ Since the Sultaan had grown sick of him, he did not accept any body's intercession and put him to death. After the slaying of Udaya Shrii, Hasan's campaign broke

-
1. RTJ, *sh.*, 504; Joonaraaja does not anywhere call Udaya Shrii 'Raaval'.
 2. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 126.
 3. The translator has omitted the important *shlookas* 510-14, which describe the scheme of Udayashrii and widow of Lavlaka, to put Hasan on the throne. When the scheme got exposed, Udaya Shrii sent Hasan away.
 4. 'Koott' is the Sanskrit for fort, but the translator has taken Loohar Koott at the name and added 'fort' separately ([image](#) 127).
 5. The original account says that when Udaya Shrii wanted to go to Prince, the king put him in prison and killed him (RTJ, *sh.*, 520-21).
 6. As Udaya Shrii had been imprisoned and was subsequently killed in prison, this tale can only be treated as a figment of the Persian translator's fertile imagination.

down. Sultaan sent huge gifts to the residents of Loohar Koott to arrest Hasan and hand him over to Sultaan. Sultaan threw him into prison. Having done away with the challenger, he set about conquering the land. During his tour on the bank of river Vyath, he founded a city in his own name, called Kutubudiin Puur.¹

Towards the end of his rule a famine broke out and prices went up all over the realm. Sultaan gave away much alms and grants and took great care of the mendicants and promoted public welfare.²

Though Sultaan had grown old, he had no issue. Day and night he yearned for a son and built great monasteries to obtain a son. At this time Yoogii Brahmanaath came to Kashmir. He was peerless in penance and prayer. Sultaan went to him and said, "I benefit the public as much as I can and do none a bad turn. Subjects are happy with my aid and assistance. I do not know for which sin, I am denied a son."

The Yoogii said, "Rest assured, for the fortunate and the favoured get all their wishes fulfilled. Give this *prasaada* which I have consecrated, to all your wives, you love, to eat and have congress within the stipulated time so that a fine son is conceived".

Sultaan acted as per Yoogii's instructions and within some time a beautiful son was born to him.³ His eyes shone seeing the son and he named him Singaar [Shringaar].⁴ The wife of Udaipaadaka [Udaka]⁵ was appointed his nurse. Another son was born of the same wife. Sultaan named him Haibat Khaan and assigned him to

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 127.

2. This is an inversion of the original *shlooka*: to ease the public suffering on account of famines every year he performed a yagnya giving away large gifts in the *Bhadra* month (RTJ, *sh.*, 528).

3. The king obtained an issue through the blessings of Yoogii Brahmanaath (RTJ, *sh.*, 531).

4. RTJ, *sh.*, 533

5. Additional *shlooka* (655), following RTJ, *sh.*, 533, in the Bombay edition (Kaul, Sanskrit text, page 95) tells that Udaka, from Bhaandda, was the maternal cousin of the queen (Subhatta).

the same nurse for bringing up. These two sons were still young¹ when Sultaan passed away. The length of his reign was fifteen years, five months and two days.

Sultaan **Sikandar Butshikan** When Sultaan Kutubudiin died, his elder son named Shringaar was put on throne, and given the title Sultaan Sikandar.² When Sikandar gained ascendancy, he wedded Shoobha.³ A son named Muhammad was born to her. Shortly thereafter, the son died. Abetted by *Udiipaadrī* [Udaka], queen Shoobha concealed his death from people.⁴ She took another boy, and brought it up as Muhammad.

After the death of his brother,⁵ Sultaan deprived *Udī* [Udaka]⁶ of his trust and appointed others to the exalted posts. On his own request, he sent him to Tibet. He sent his own (i.e. king's) army with him and separating his old soldiers put them under his own watch. Sometime later, Udhaka returned after conquering Tibet and joined the king's service.

Collaborating with opponent of Sultaan, named Nathu, he killed the Sultaan's brother-in-law, without any reason.⁷ With the union of Udaka and Nathu, their rebellion against Sultaan stood

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 128

2. Joonaraaja does not explicitly say so, though he tells that Udaka and Sahaka performed the *raaja abhisheek* of Sikandra (RTJ, sh., 542). Joonaraaja does not call any of the Shamiirii kings 'Sultaan'.

3. The Persian text actually says "*dokhtari Shoobha raanii ba aqadi khveesh dar aavard*" – brought the daughter of queen Shoobha into his wedlock – when in fact Shoobha was his queen (RTJ, sh., 544). The Persian translator may have meant '*dokhtar*' in the sense of a maiden.

4. This is an invention of the Persian translator. There is no such mention in the original. (RTJ, sh., 544-572).

5. The Persian translator omits the report of the original that Udaka had poisoned Haibat (RTJ, sh., 545). However, Joonaraaja tells that it happened after Udaka's return from Tibet (RTJ, sh., 549).

6. Udaka was the brother of Sikandar's mother Subhatta (RTJ, sh., 544).

7. This appears to be a misreading of RTJ, sh., 549, which tells of haity Udaka killing queen Shoobha's brother, Khunjaraaja. There is no mention of any other person (Nathu) in the original account.

proven.¹ Udaka, appointing one of his men² to spy in the Sultaan's house, gathered his force and went to pargana Akar [Oolar] to await further developments.³

Though Sultaan summoned Udaka with conciliatory letters, he did not return. Choosing to battle, he came into the Kuruskeetra plateau near Pampore. Sultaan sent Ladaraaja with other commanders to fight him and himself went in their wake. That day buffaloes of people were grazing in the field. Udaka's army taking them to be Sultaan's cavalry, fled away without fighting. Dispersed on their own they did not stop at any place till Deevasarah.⁴ Chasing them, the Sultaan killed most of them. After the victory he returned to Srinagar. Rejoicing at his return, people beat drums in joy.

Later, the Yaal clan gave up submission and fought the Sultaan fiercely. Udaka too was with them. Sultaan defeated them, and slayed a huge number. Udaka fled away and went to Baanihaal pargana. The ruler there arrested him and sent him to the Sultaan. In spite of his rebellion, Sultaan spared his life and put him in prison. Finally, unable to bear the hardship of prison, he slit his own throat and died.⁵

Freed of the worry of enemies, Sultaan conquered the Raajaas in the adjacent areas and gathered a huge force.⁶ When, Timor

-
1. Not in the original account (RTJ, *sh.*, 549-50).
 2. Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 550) gives the name of this person as Nimmaka and says that Udhaka went to Hooldda in the Oolar pargana, present day Traal.
 3. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image 129](#)
 4. The original account says Vitastaapura (RTJ, *sh.*, 554). This has been identified with Vyathavotur, the traditional source of Vitastaa River, near Veernaag. It was then in the Deevasarah pargana.
 5. The Persian translator has dilated the account, and added this second rebellion on his own. The original account, speaks of the king giving chase after Udaka's man had fled at seeing the buffaloes, catching up with him at Vitastaapura and arresting him (RTJ, *sh.*, 551-55). Udhaka killed himself, in the prison (RTJ, *sh.*, 556).
 6. The original *shlooka* says: to dispel the gathering gloom of the hauteur of kings, he began his campaign, which affrighted Indra too (RTJ, *sh.*,

conquered Hindustaan, he had sent two elephants to Sultaan.¹ He felt greatly honored and gratified at this. He sent a petition to *Saahibikaraan* (Timor) offering his submission and loyalty. He had, then, written that he would present himself wherever ordered.²

He sent back Timor's envoys with much tribute. Reaching Timor, they related whatever they had heard from Sultaan Sikandar. Favoring him, he sent him an ornamented robe and a horse with embroidered saddle and ordered that he (Sultaan Sikandar) should meet him in Punjab on his victorious return from Dahlii. When the order reached Sultaan, he made preparations for the meeting. Hearing that Timor had returned to Punjab through the Shivaalik mountain route, he set out for meeting him, taking many gifts with him.

While enroute, he heard that lords and ministers of Timor have said that Sultaan Sikandar should present three thousand horses. He was much perturbed at this news. He returned to his land from Punjab, and sent a petition to Timor saying: Since I could not arrange a fitting present for your followers, I have delayed the meeting for some time. I shall present myself after arranging suitable presents." When he (Timor) learnt of the subject of petition³ and heard that some ministers have demanded that Sikandar bring a gift of three thousand horses, he chastised them all and pitying the envoys of Sikandar said that perverted ministers had made demands, and that Sultaan Sikandar be assured and should come without any fear.⁴

559). It carries the word '*timir*' which is used for Timor in the additional *shlookas* (Kaul, Sanskrit text, page 101-2). Since Sikandra is not known to have made any conquests, Joonaraaja's *shlooka* translated here may actually refer to Timor setting out on his campaigns to douse the hauteur of kings, not Sikandar, the *Shahmiirii* king (RTJ, *sh.*, 556).

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 130.
2. None of this and the tale following is found in the original account, which only says that Timor sent him two elephants (RTJ, *sh.*, 561-67). It is all invention of the Persian translator, which the later Persian chroniclers, including Farishta, have copied.
3. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 131.
4. As mentioned above, this whole tale is the invention of the Persian

When Sikandar's men returned to Kashmir they related to him what they had heard from Timor. He was very happy and setting out to meet Timor left Kashmir. When he had passed through Baaramulah, he heard that Timor had crossed the river Sindh and hurried to Samarkand. He reckoned that he could not meet him. He sent his envoys to him with much tribute, and himself returned to Kashmir.

Sultaan Sikandar was so munificent that hearing of it learned ones from Iraq, Khoraasaan and Trans Oxonia came to him. Leading them was the scholar named Miir Muhaamad who had garnered full erudition and scholarship in his youth. Day by day, Sultaan became more and more devoted to him. His devotion reached such a stage that he used to prostrate himself before him, and take orders from him.

He took instruction in prayer and rites of religion from him. Accompanied by him, he totally uprooted the non-Islamic customs and idol worship from Kashmir. On this account, many Muslims from the adjacent places gathered in Kashmir.¹ The religion of Islaam and the orders of Shariyat were enforced in this land. Ordinances of Shariyat were promulgated all over.

Around that time, the ruler of Udbandpur named Feerooz² rebelled and was defeated by the Sultaan's army. As per custom he sent to Sultaan his daughter named Miiraa, peerless in beauty and grace. Sultaan took her in wedlock, and begat fine sons upon

translator; it is not found in the original account. Joonaraaja only speaks of the elephants being gifted. He then describes the grandeur of these elephants and their being housed separately (RTJ, *sh.*, 561-67). The elaborate diplomatic missions, demands and counter demands, negotiations, the king going, returning and then setting out again, added by the Persian translator, would have taken months. Timor did not tarry on his return from Delhi invasion, for any length of time, as he was impatient to return.

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 132
2. The name of the king is not given in the original (RTJ, *sh.*, 577). Feerooz was the name of one of the sons, Sikandar begat on his first queen Shooobha. All her sons except Feerooz were banished by the king (RTJ, *sh.*, 588).

her (like) Shaahii Khaan, who came to be known as Baddu'shah and was unparalleled in justice and benevolence.

About that time, an alchemist named Mahaadeeva appeared in Kashmir. He had an elixir with him. It is said that if one *misqaal* of it was mixed with a thousand *misqaal* of metal, it turned into gold. He synthesized gold in presence of king. Since his elixir was exhausted and his work did not take off, he decided to leave Kashmir. As fate had it, his feet got restrained by the fine clime. To keep his work going he faked things inside his shop and added hard ingredients to gold. He also performed some tricks which, the people could not see through and produced pure gold from the crucible and showed it to the people saying that this is a secret process. One day, the king came to know and exposing his secret wanted to punish him. He was scared and committed suicide.¹

Thereabout, Sultaan selected persons of exceeding wisdom as his counselors appointing Ladaraaj, the physician Shankar and Siya Bahat, his *sardars*², he sent the army to conquer Chambo.³ Pala Deeva, the Raaja there, sent his daughter as present, to Sultaan through Shankar, the physician. Shankar praised the Raaja exaggeratedly before Sultaan and the Raaja became friends with him. Out of jealousy, Suha Bahat conveyed Raaja's (unsavory) words to Sultaan, defeated the Raaja's intent and destroyed his kingdom.

This happenstance, in detail, is that when Timor had graced Chanbo with his coming, he had ordered loot and rapine of the land and captured most of the people there. Jasrat Khookhar, who was the leader of his tribe, too got captured and was in the thrall of Saahibkoraan, and reached Samarkand. After the death of

-
1. The Persian translator adds his own details to the succinct account in the original (RTJ, *sh.*, 580-84).
 2. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 133.
 3. Another of the inventions of the Persian translator, this war and the related events are not in the original, which only tells of the three being appointed ministers (RTJ, *sh.*, 585) and goes on to speak of Meera's sons in the next *shlooka* (RTJ, *sh.*, 586).

Sahibkoooran, he came out of that place and landed in Punjab. Suha Bahat sent him a letter from Kashmir asking "What you are doing there. Come and serve Sultaan Sikandar." Reaching Kashmir, Jasrat received much consideration and counsel from Sultaan. The Sultaan sent a huge army led by Siya Bahat to aid Jasrat in conquering Chanbo and granted Binbar, and whichever other places he could occupy, as pastures to him, and sped him on. Siya Bahat, out of the animosity he bore for Raaja Pala, destroyed his kingdom with the aid of Jasrat, throwing the Raaja out. Sultaan's reputation in the world around grew greatly, on account of his benefaction to Jasrat.¹⁻²

Three sons were borne to Sultaan by queen Miiraa. One was Miir Khaan, the second Shaahii Khaan and the third Muhammad Khaan. No son was born to queen Shoobha. She took others' sons and brought them up as her own and told people they were her real sons. When Sultaan found no trace of his in their physiognomy, he exiled all of them except the son Feeroz Khaan, who he found resembled him. He brought him up like other sons.³ Shoobha, who had done all this in envy of her co-wife, grew very sad at not bearing any sons.⁴ Finally, two daughters were born to her. Sultaan gave one of them in marriage to the ruler of Sind and married the other to the ruler of Udbanddpuur.⁵

-
1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 134.
 2. As mentioned before this tale inserted between the appointment of three ministers (RTJ, *sh.*, 585) and birth of Meera's sons (RTJ, *sh.*, 586) is not there in the original account of Joonaraaja.
 3. The Persian translator is again dilating upon the very concise *shlooka* of original account (RTJ, *sh.*, 587).
 4. RTJ, *sh.*, 588 says that Pirooz was not banished as he resembled the king, exceedingly. Interestingly, the additional *shlooka* 737 in Bombay edition following this *shlooka* calls Pirooz '*pramiit-maatrikam*' meaning 'whose mother had died' (additional *shlooka* Kaul, text page 107). The text of R N Singh says '*mrit-maatrikam*' which also means the same (Joonaraaja, Hindi tr., page 350). Later Joonaraaja, speaking of the return of Pirooz during the reign of Alii Shah, says people felt that Sikandar had returned from heaven (RTJ, *sh.*, 644-45).
 5. Additional *shlooka* 773 (Kaul, text page 111); the next *shlooka* (774, Kaul, *loc. cit.*) calls Feerooz/ Pirooz '*Shoobha-nandan*' – son of Shoobha.

About that time, he gave much money and numerous goods of fine quality to the scholar Miir Sayyid Muhammad and sent him to go his own land. He sent his son Feeroz as his escort to conduct him to his land and to remain in his service.¹ Some time later, Nasiirudiin, the ruler of Sind, who was Sultaan's son-in-law, rebelled. Sultaan sent an army to arrest him, and imprisoned him. He assigned his realm to Fakhrudiin, an intimate of his own. He founded a city at the feet of *Kohi Maaraan* [Pradyumnaadri]² called Sikandar Puur, now known as Navhatta and included in Srinagar.³ At that time, Sultaan spent his treasures in alms.

Mogols,⁴ who came from alien lands were employed and got consideration and benedictions from Sultaan. During his rule, Muslims and Mogols came to Kashmir and overturned the ways of Brahmans and their sciences. Sultaan ordered that wherever they found a temple they should shatter it. There after he got the title *Butshikan* – iconoclast. His minister Siyah Bahat converted to Islam and oppressed Brahmans and destroyed temples. All force was excreted in breaking the temple.

Amongst these was the grand temple at Bijbihaarah, dedicated to Mahaadeeva. Sultaan ordered it to be uprooted from the foundation. How so deep they dug, they could not reach the end and its base could not be seen. They shattered the temple at Chakradar. Huge flames arose there from. Sultaan, too, saw them. At that time, wherever a shrine of Hindus was found, it was razed to ground.

A wonder amongst these was the lofty temple built by Lalitadatya at Paraspur. It was consecrated to Mercury. After completing the grand building, Raaja asked the astrologers "How long shall it last? Who shall destroy and shatter it?" They

1. Was this exiling of Shooabha's sons engineered, as had been done with the sons of Laxmii?
2. This is the name in the original (RTJ, *sh.*, 589).
3. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 135.
4. The translator seems to have used Mogols (Mugals) for Sayyids, in deference to his own Mugal masters.

answered, "It is a shame that evil words should cross Raaja's tongue. It is not proper that, after completing the edifice,¹ he should seek the name of its destroyer." Raaja pressed them hard, and the astrologers examining the constellations said, "After the passage one thousand and one hundred years, a *paadashah* named Sikandar shall destroy it and shatter the image of Mercury that has been laid inside it." This was engraved on a sheet of copper, put in a box and buried under its foundation. When the edifice was shattered, that box was brought out. Sultaan said, "If only they had put this writing on the wall. Knowing it, I would not have ordered destruction of this edifice."²

Not a city or a temple remained, which was not razed down under Siyah Bahat's supervision. Sultaan left the spring of Sandah Braarii intact. The spring bubbles out in South Kashmir, in Pargana Brang in the feet of a hill to its North. Over the course of Sun, during spring, it bubbles out twice a day, for two months, and then again settles down. After the said period, it stops. During the remaining months of the year it is empty and dry. He did not destroy it³ because of this wonder, and that shrine of *kaafirs* exists to this day.⁴ Thereafter he ordered that wine be banned all over his realm. Siyah Bahat brought to the notice of the Sultaan that in Islamic books it is written that acquaintance with Hindus and

-
1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 136.
 2. There is not even a hint of this elaborate fable in the original account of Joonaraaja describing the destruction of the temples by Sikandar and his men (RTJ, *sh.*, 589-611). The later Persian chroniclers have reproduced it without verifying the original account, which has been available all along.
 3. This tale too is not in the original account. The last line indicates that the Persian translator is writing on his own. The first translator, Shah Muhammad belonged to this area. In fact, most of the additions and interpolations, found in this translation, should be attributed to this first Persian translator and not Badaayunii, who only rehashed the account given to him for what we would today call extensive editing, as per the report of Abul Fazl.
 4. *Vakaati Kashmiir*, the Persian chronicle written in mid 18th century, tells that Muslim saint Davla Baabaa, later destroyed the shrine when he saw that Hindus used to congregate at this shrine in large numbers (VK, Persian text, page 268-69)

reliance upon them is not proper under any circumstances¹, and explained the relevant injunctions and turned him against the sect.²

Then, the Sultaan reluctantly converted some Hindus to Islam and imposed *jiziya* on others who did not convert. Many of the Hindus preferred to die and did not convert to Islam.³ The group that converted to Islam, obtained consideration and counsel from Sultaan and converted others to this religion till most preferred to convert instead of paying *jiziya*. Payment of the tax thus ceased all over the Kashmir.⁴

Towards the end, Sultaan was taken ill of high fever. He summoned his eldest son Miir Khaan, bestowed the title Alii Shah upon him, assigned the kingdom to him and passed away.⁵ His reign lasted twenty-two years, nine months and six days.⁶

Sultaan Alii Shah, son of Sultaan Sikandar succeeded his father. Though he was young in years the surrounding raajas having tasted the rigours and hardness of Sultaan Sikandar submitted to Sultaan Alii Shah because of that fear. Sultaan assigned all the affairs of state Siyah Bahat and Ladii Maagree. They swore loyalty on the sword-rinsing water, for no other oath was more sacred

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 137
2. This too is not there in the original account. The Persian translator is offering alibis for Sikandar and putting the blame on Siya Bahat. This is, probably, the first time that the alibi is being offered, to absolve Sikandara, without any basis in the original account. Later Persian chroniclers as well as the modern historiographers like Suufii repeat it.
3. The translator has diluted the ferocity of the program of conversion, detailed in the original (RTJ, 603-9).
4. Joonaraaja does not say so. The translator has rarely adhered to the original account in his whole description of this reign. Apart from the interpolations pointed out above, the description is a variant summation of the graphic account given by Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 591-611).
5. Four additional *shlokas*, 778-81, in Bombay edition following RTJ *sh.* 610, tell that lightening from sky fell upon him causing him grievous injuries, which got infested with worms and he died a death of deep agony, as a foretaste of hell he was destined for (Kaul, text page 112).
6. Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 612) only says that he died after anointing his eldest son, in the year 89 i.e. 4489 LE = (1413 CE).

before them. Thus having sworn allegiance to one another, they had no differences and ran the affairs in consonance.¹

Siya Bahat having established his power was after capturing and throwing out Ladii Maagree. He was powerful and wise and his sons too were strong and influential, especially the eldest son Muhammad who held a full sway in Baangil area. On this account, Siya Bahat could not overcome Ladii and his sons. He was on the lookout and waited for Ladii and Muhammad to come to the city together so that he could imprison them. With this intent, he often summoned Ladii's other sons, of whom Taajii Maagree was the eldest, to the court and held consultations with them on state affairs. To create disunity there, he indulged them much.

One day he cunningly called Muhammad Maagree to the court, to capture him. He got wind of the intent, and left Kashmir with three hundred cavalrymen. Because of his manly reputation, none dared give chase. Seeing Muhammad getting out of hand, he sent a force to the house of Ladii Maagree. He was ill. Siya Bahat's men came on the pretext of enquiring after his health. Thus having put him off guard, they arrested Ladii along with Shankar, the physician. Siya Bahat put these two along with other sons of Ladii, except Muhammad, in prison. People lamented this perfidy of Siya Bahat towards Ladii.²

After his exit, Muhammad went to Raaja Govind, who ruled the nearby Udbaanddpuur.³ Since, during the reign of Sultaan Sikandar, Ladii Maagree and Raaja Govind had borne friendly relations and that, it is said, Ladii had got the realm for Raaja Govind from Sultaan; Muhammad thought that Raaja Govind would consider the earlier relation and grant him a place in the vicinity of his realm. He, however, was piqued with Muhammad for having dishonored him once and was looking for revenge.

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 138

2. The original is different: "The public lamented the death of the aged *margpatii*, like that of a father." (RTJ, *sh.*, 640)

3. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 139.

He wrote to Siya Bahat, "I shall arrest him and hand him over to you." Siya Bahat sent him silks, saffron and other fine gifts from Kashmir. He handed Muhammad over to Siya Bahat's men. Siya Bahat amputated one of his arms, and imprisoned him in Beervah forte, which was on much height and people did not visit it. Muhammad's milk-brothers went there on a pretext and took the chained Muhammad out. Hearing of this Siya Bahat was much perturbed. He ordered slaying of aged Ladii Maagree without any regard for the oath he had taken.

After killing Ladii, Siya Bahat was so afraid of Muhammad that he could find no repose day or night. Around that time, Sultaan Sikandar's son Feeroz, who on his father's orders had accompanied Miir Sayyid Muhammad to Iraan, as mentioned above, returned to Kashmir. Muhammad, taking lead, joined him. Feerooz Khaan, mobilizing a huge army, set out to conquer Kashmir. Siya Bahat appointed *Ladoo Lone* [Shrii Lad] and *Gavrii Bahat* [Gavraka]¹ commanders and sent them with a large army to fight Feerooz Khaan. They defeated Feerooz Khaan.²

After the victory, Siya Bahat gave Kamraaj to Gavrii and appointed *Ladoo* [Ladaraaja] *Miir Bakshii* [*Kampaneeshvara*]³. Great oppression of the subjects ensued. Brahmans were exiled. Siya Bahat appointed guards on the routes to watch over them and deny passage. He also closed the routes. Brahmans, subjected to extreme persecution, killed themselves. Some poisoned themselves, some downed themselves, some jumped from mountains and some hanged themselves. Some fled to Kohistaan.⁴ At that time, Siya

1. These are the actual names (RTJ, *sh.*, 646).

2. End of the digitalized manuscript, *image* 140.

3. As per Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 648) Ladaraaja was made *Kampaneeshvara*, which term as per R N Singh (Joonaraaja, Hindi tr., page 178), was used for commander-in-chief. *Miir Bakshii* is the Mugal chief clerk, who disbursed pay to soldiers.

4. These details of oppression given in the Persian translation, and earlier too, are only a short summary of the graphic details given in the original account (RTJ, *sh.*, 651-675). The Persian translation omits many vital points like the resistance by the persecuted Brahmans (RTJ, *sh.*, 655, 668, 672-73), the direct involvement of the king (670-71), the role of Mala

Bahat enjoyed great power under Sultaan Alii Shah. He sent away the scholar Sayyid Muhammad, though there was no reason.¹ He imprisoned Mula Nuurudiin, the teacher of all *ulmaa*, along with his group of followers, because of a personal grudge born of a superstition.²

Meanwhile Shaahii Khaan, son of Sultaan Sikandar, who was peerless in wisdom and valour, gathered a huge force.³ He sought to dispose off Siya Bahat, but since Siya Bahat feared him much he was very cautious. Though Shaahii Khaan tried much, he could not dare to get at him. He too, over the four years when he assumed power and sway, had been endeavoring to throw out Shaahii Khaan. Gathering soldiers and Islamic scholars, he had evinced much cunning⁴, but could not accomplish the object.⁵

Meanwhile Siya Bahat suffered from Tuberculosis. Howso the physicians treated him, there was no avail and he died of the disease. Prior to death, he appointed his brother Hansii and Gavra Bhatta in his own stead.

Ladoo Loon [Ladaraaja] afraid of them went to Deevasarah. Sultaan Alii Shah brought him back to the city with assurances.

Nuurudiin (674) etc.

1. This is incorrect. There is no such mention in the original account. Miir Sayyid Muhammad had left during the reign of Sikandar, as stated earlier and mentioned again in the account of the return of Feerooz, Sikandar's son born of Shoobha (*infra*).
2. This is not only incorrect, but also the reverse of the report in the original account, which says: Brahmins took refuge with Ratnaakara to protect themselves, which won him the appreciation (RTJ, *sh.*, 672). But Mala Nuurdiina, the great guru of Muslim, got Ratnaakara arrested (RTJ, *sh.*, 673). From the time of the rise of Mula Nuurudiin, the ruler without *chaamra* and *chatra* when the disease to pollute spread, Suha Bahat had no repose (Medieval Kashmir, S L Sadhu, page 59).
3. This is not in the original account here; it happened much later, after Suha's death.
4. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 141.
5. This account is invented, not translated from the original. Joonaraaja says that Shaahii Khaan was perturbed at Suha Bhatta's conduct, but could do nothing (RTJ, *sh.*, 676-78). The mention of three or four years occurs in relation to Suha's excesses, before his death (RTJ, *sh.*, 679).

Hansii [Hamsa] and *Goorii* [Gavraka] creating mistrust got him imprisoned.¹ A few months later, they became enemies unto each other. Under a compromise, Hamsa got him (Ladaraaja) out of the prison. Gavraka fled to Bijbihara.² This news reached Sultaan Alii Shah. Sultaan was still in consultations when Hamsa suddenly besieged the court. Harassed, Sultaan went away. Gavraka came out with his brother to battle Hamsa. Ladaraaja killed both of them. Thereafter the star of Hamsa rose and he gained the upper hand.

Shaahii Khaan, witnessing his ascendancy, sought to throw him out. But since he was still young, he postponed his campaign for some days. Hans too was in discord with Shaahii Khaan and was ever in look out, but got no opportunity. Shaahii Khaan, coming to know of his cunning, brought the Thaakur clan round³ and killed Hans on the day of Eid at Eid-gah. Shaahii Khaan's soldiers finding Ladii Loon, and apprehending that once the din arose and Ladii Loon on getting wind of the killing would come to battle, took lead and attacking him killed him on the same day. Thus they cleared the world of those factitious beings.

People of Kashmir were happy at these happenstances and sent blessings to Shaahii Khaan. Since Shahii Khaan possessed the acumen to govern people awaited his rule. Sultaan Alii Shah too assigned the affairs to him. With his sword and sagacity he took the lead in administration. He brought all ministers round and advanced his control by the day. Except Miir Kaisar, an immigrant Mogol, no other sardar remained with Alii Shah. He poisoned Alii Sultaan against Shahii Khaan. He soured their association and said, "He does not obey your orders."

After some days, the Sultaan out of dire expediency, set out on a journey of *ziyaarat* of *mausoleums*. He called brothers Shaahii Khaan and Muhammad Khaan and said, "World is a facile place

1. RTJ, *sh.*, 683: Joonaraaja makes no mention of Alii Shah in bringing him back.
2. The original account here says that on Ladraaja's release Gavraka got slain (RTJ, *sh.*, 685).
3. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 142.

and does not last. What is the use of wealth if it is not spent in the way of the Lord? Life that is not devoted to prayer is futile. Who will heal the heart which is not imbued with the love and care of the eternal Master? If the body and limbs do not aid one to visit the shrines, spending every moment in sheer noise, they are useless and rusted.¹ On account of these considerations I wish to spent this life for the eternal end, and to visit *ziyaarats* and shrines. Since the affairs of the state have devolved upon you, I wish to assign the kingdom to you. You should so work that there is no strife between brothers and the people prosper." Shaahii Khaan said, "Pilgrimage and visiting shrines is² the work of mendicants, free from worldly cares. For you, who have the burden of the kingdom upon your head, no prayer is better than ensuring that the people in your care are protected and kept free from the hardships and calamities that are the Lofty Lord's inevitabilities and that they spend their days in ease and devotion and you share those with them. Nobody is removing you from throne for you are the inheritor and master of the kingdom with power to imprison. All we brothers are your servants. Probably, some *munaafeks* (miscreants) have told you things about me and estranged you. It is not proper that you should leave me helpless and go wandering."

Sultaan smiled and said, "Though prosperity of people is my worship yet it is not true that somebody else's prayer would absolve the other. Since both you brothers are my two arms, my heart is happy. It is clear that if the younger brother because of his youth does an ugly deed, the elder one should overlook it."

There after Alii Shah appointed Shaahii Khaan his successor and willingly or unwillingly bestowed the title Sultaan Zainulaabdiin upon him.³ He said to Muhammad Khaan, "Give up the ambition of kingdom and obey him." Zainulaabdiin gifted

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 143.

2. The Persian text (MM [image](#) 144, line 4) has "... *kaari darveeshaan neest*" - is not the work of mendicants - which must be an error.

3. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 144.

fine jewels, monies and precious goods to Sultaan Alii Shah. He accompanied him for three or four stages of journey and then sending some cavalry with him, returned.

After Sultaan Alii Shah covered a few stages, some of his men made him rueful of the journey and every time reminded him of the ambience and the pleasant climate of Kashmir. His determination weavered; his view of the route and hardships of journey, hunger and thirst got clouded. He consulted his companions and said, "How can we enter Kashmir with this meager force?" Hence, there from he turned towards Jammu with the objective of seeking aid. When he reached Jammu, the Raaja of Jammu, whose daughter Sultaan Alii Shah had (wedded), came out to receive him, and promised him aid in capturing Kashmir. Since it was the rainy season, Alii Shah spent that season in Jammu.

In the beginning of winter, Alii Shah and Raaja Jammu reached Raajoorii with a huge army. Raaja Raajoorii too set out in their aid. Sultaan Zainulaabdiin, in consideration that Alii Shah was the elder brother, did not deem fighting proper and returned the kingship, which he held as trust, to Alii Shah. He left Kashmir and went to Kohistaan with the group of Tthaakurs. Alii Shah's soldiers fell upon the city,¹ rapined it and oppressed the people. Sultaan Alii Shah came to head the kingdom, again, and distributed the treasury among his soldiers.

Miir Kaisar and Khvaaaja Kaazii, the ministers of Sultaan took to strife and persecution. They confiscated the properties of people and captured their families.² Sultaan had not the power to prevent them. No sage or saint remained in Kashmir, who was not rendered homeless. The behavior of Sultaan Alii Shah changed. He ill-treated the Mogols who had reinforced his army. He confiscated the fine horses, precious stones, jewels and all

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 145

2. This Persian translation is a very diluted version of the original account which describes the loot and rapine by the foreign troops (RTJ, *sh.*, 726-27), rape of women by Miir Kaisar (*sh.*, 721-22), and such total destruction of the realm that 'being kingless would've been better' (*sh.*, 724-25).

choice articles they had obtained. He prohibited them from all areas and routes they had rapined, while he himself went around unrestrained.¹

Meanwhile Shaahii Khaan came to know that Jasrat Khookha, who had been imprisoned by Timor had escaped and captured the realm of Siyaalkoot etc. Shaahii Khaan left Kohistaan through the forest and went to Jasrat.² Hearing of this Sultaan Alii Shah wrote to Jasrat, "It was not proper for you to give refuge to my enemy. Capture him and send him over."³ He mobilized a huge army against Jasrat. After consulting his ministers and lords⁴, he took a large army of cavalry and infantry and set out to battle Jasrat. Every route that Sultaan trod, he left it totally destroyed. The soldiers so oppressed the subjects as not even an enemy force would do. They put every village and city they passed through⁵ on fire.⁶ When Alii Shah reached the realm of Pakal Haal⁷ he received a letter from the Raaja of Jammu saying, "Though Sultaan has a huge army, the Khookhars battle like lions. Your soldiers are not acquainted with it and should know about his style of fighting. The Sultaan should wait where he is, till we reach there." Khvaaja Kaazii told the Sultaan that, if they come, the victory would be credited to them. Sultaan Alii Shah acting as per his advice plunged into the battle. A fierce battle ensued.⁸ So many people

1. This is contrary to the original account which says that all these things which 'adorned the king were wrested from him by the *Yavanas*' (RTJ, sh., 726).
2. The original says that Jasrat sent messages to Shaahii inviting him to his county (RTJ, sh., 730).
3. This is not in the original which only tells of the king marching against Jasrat (RTJ, sh., 732).
4. The original account (RTJ, sh., 736) says that *Yavanas* flattered the king and set him on war but the army was opposed to it.
5. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 146.
6. RTJ, sh., 736-39: Joonaraaja here calls this force a *maleechha* force either to emphasize its being Muslim or dominated by immigrant 'Mogols' as the Persian translator calls the alien Sayyids.
7. 'Pakal Haal' would be the original name of what is now called Pahkli or Pakalii.
8. The original says that the battle took place at Mudgraavyaala (RTJ, sh.,

on both sides were killed that only the Lord can give a count. Among the Hindus there is a saying that in a fight where ten thousand men got killed, one headless body comes to move. It is called Kunband/Gunband in Hindi. It is said that in that battle many headless bodies moved in that manner.¹ The truth is known to Allah alone!

Finally Sultaan Alii Shah could hold out no longer and fled. Sultaan Zainulaabdiin, chasing him, entered Kashmir.² People were happy at his coming and beat drums of joy. Sultaan Alii Shah's reign lasted six years and nine months.

Sultaan Zainulaabdiin son of Sultaan Sikandar came to rule the kingdom, after the debacle of Alii Shah. He promulgated benevolence and justice and put an end to cruelty and oppression that had ruled. He mobilized a huge force to aid Jasrat Khookar and saw him off towards Dahlii. Though Jasrat couldn't challenge the king at Dahlii,³ he captured whole Punjab, with the army of Sultaan.⁴ The Sultaan invaded Tibet and conquered it. He destroyed the realms on the banks of Sind River and killed most of the dwellers there.

He made Muhammad Khaan, his younger brother, his counsel and referred to him in all affairs and campaigns, while he himself attended to delivery of justice.⁵ He held sessions with men

740), which has been identified as (Thana) Mandi in Raajoorii (Sadhu, *ibid.*, page, 85)

1. This is not in the original account of Joonaraaja (RTJ, Sh., 746-49). A century later, Shuka Pandit speaks of *Kabandhas Yakshas* etc., in the last battle during Kaashgarii invasion of 1532-33 (RTSH, II:81). However, the Persian translator does not mention it there. (*q.v*)
2. The original says that the king was destroyed in the battle (RTJ, sh., 749). It does not speak of any chase. Shriivara says that 'Alii Shas was bound and killed by Mallik Jasratha (RTS, I: 3:107).
3. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 147.
4. This is not in the original. In a later *shlooka*, Joonaraaja tells that king of Khukha was very dear to him (RTJ, sh., 761) and in another much later *shlooka* he says that 'oppressed' by the king of Ddillii, Jasrath took refuge with the king, who protected him like a mountain (RTJ, sh., 785).
5. This is an incorrect translation of sh., 760 which says that his brother became his counselor in policy matters and judge in investigation of 'shastras' meaning laws.

of various vocations. He was a learned person. His gatherings were full of the learned Hindus and Muslims. He approved of the science of music. He was ever engaged in building, promoting agriculture¹ and digging canals from remote places.

He had ordered that all over his realm, if any theft occurred the nobles of that area would be penalized. With this promulgation, thievery was uprooted from his kingdom. He abolished the cruel and oppressive laws in force since Siya Bahat's time. New rules, which had not been there during the rule of previous Sultaan, were promulgated in his reign.²

In every village and city he put up copper plaques engraved with the order: All laws of cruelty and oppression have been abolished from the Kashmir domain; whosoever succeeds me and does not follow this rule, he would be answerable to the Lord.³ He was cured with the efforts of a proficient physician, Shriyya Bhatta. On his request the Brahmans who had been exiled during the reign of Sultaan Sikandar on Siya Bahat's counsel, were called back⁴ and granted properties. He restored their shrines to Hindus. He prohibited *jiziya*.⁵

He banned cow-slaughter. He summoned the learned and wise Brahmans⁶ and took an oath from them that they would

1. The Persian translator appears to have mistaken Joonaraaja's simili of contrast: 'he reversed the agriculture process' in the respect of his uprooting his enemies (RTJ, *sh.*, 764).
2. This is an imprecise translation of RTJ, *sh.*, 755: The king revived the disregarded laws of the previous kings as the spring revives the plants destroyed by winter.
3. This is not in the original and appears to be translator's construction on RTJ, *sh.*, 770 saying: 'the Turushakas, did not now oppress the Brahmans as they had done before.'
4. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 148.
5. Actually, he only reduced the rate of *jiziya* tax on non-Muslims (RTJ, *sh.*, 817).
6. It should be Muslims, as 'asking wise Brahmans not to violate the scriptures of Hindus' is pointless. The Persian translator may be wrongly translating Shriivara's text saying that 'he directed those who knew the *shastras* to persevere in their studies, for they work justly who know the

not lie and would not violate whatever is written in the books of Hindus. He lifted the ban on the customs of Hindus like tilak, sati, etc. which had been imposed during the reign of Sultaan Sikandar.¹

He abolished the customs of gifts and presents that the *shak-daars* (watchmen) took from people. He ordered that merchants should not hoard and should not charge more than the due profit and freight and they should not obscenely inflate the rates. He freed all the people languishing in prisons since the rule of previous Sultaans.

One of his early ordinations was that the treasury of every conquered realm was to be distributed and fixed the tribute from people of that domain in accordance with that in vogue in his own capital. He severely chastised the rebels and rascals of that place and reduced them from their exalted posts to lowly position.

He succored the weak and the mendicants, ensuring that they did not get so much as to become proud or so less as to grovel in poverty. So chaste was he that he kenned every outside woman² either a sister or mother. There was no way that anyone could commit perfidy vis-à-vis any outsider or other's properties or covet them without facing punishment from the king.

Out of benevolence for subjects, he spent more than what the revenue was. The source of Sultaan's funds was a copper mine he had found.³ Labourers were constantly making extraction there.

shaastras (RTS, I: 5: 34), telling that the king reversed the injunctions that had been imposed previously.

1. This is the addition of the Persian translator. There is no mention of *tilaka* and *sati* having been banned in the original account of Joonaraaja. It is another *alibi* of the Persian translator's to absolve Sikandar of the patently abhorrent doings. Shriivara mentions that he told the king that a cremation tax was imposed upon the Hindus cremating their dead at the Mari-Vitasta confluence, present-day Maisum, and that the king abolished it (RTS, I: 5: 57-58).
2. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image 149](#).
3. The Persian translator has mistaken Joonaraaja's mention of Jayapiidda discovering a copper mine (RTJ, sh., 883) as a discovery of Zainulaabdiin.

In the reign of Sultaans idols of gold and silver were broken and coins minted from them. That source had been exhausted. Sultaan ordered coins to be minted from the pure copper obtained from the mine and put in circulation.

Whosoever, Sultaan's ire fell upon was not necessarily punished or penalized but in fact whatever he said was enough to extirpate the evil. Whosoever he was unhappy with exited the realm as if he knew not of Sultaan's wrath and had gone out on his own. This was the manner in which affairs of the state proceeded.

During his reign people of all religions lived in harmony. There was no religious prejudice. Brahmanas and other Hindus who had been forcibly converted did not suffer these privations during the reign of Sultaan Zainulaabdiin. None of the Muslim *ulmaas* could now arraign them by the neck to check their phallii for circumcision.

Laying a canal near Kohi Maaran [Pradyumna hill] Sultaan founded a new city which ran to five *kruh*.¹ The city was adorned on a like scale.² He brought water from afar to Kaakapuur and other places, there and built canals and bridges promoting agriculture. He brought the learned and the wise, mendicants and the poor of all sects to the places which he got inhabited. With aid and assistance granted, they lived in ease there. They had goods no less than the *amiirs*. He spent the revenues of these habitations on inns and (public) eateries so that every traveler in or out could eat. In providing for the needy he expended money in cash and kind. All over Kashmir, no land remained without water, nor

There is no mention of any copper mine discovered by Zainulaabdiin in Joonaraaja who, however, tells that during his reign earth gave out jewels from its mines which were actually named *Jainamani* (RTJ, *sh.*, 884). he also speaks of gold being prospected from rivers (RTJ, *sh.*, 885) which the king ordered to be taxed at only one-sixth (RTJ, *sh.*, 886).

1. This is a misreading of *sh.*, 869: 'He built Jainanagri rich with *matthas*, extending from Pradyumna Hill to Amreshpura.' Jainanagri is the original name of what has come to be called Navashahr (new city) in the Persian chronicles.
2. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 150.

was there any place which did not receive Sultaan's care and redress. His detachment with the world was of such an order that inspite of this splendor and grandeur he did not care for to amass kingdoms, and fill his treasuries.

During the reign of Sultaan, there lived a poet named Mulaa Muhammad, who could compose couplets in any *bahar* (tune) and *kaafiya* (rhyme) any time, at any place. At the same time he could also solve any tough issue put to him. Sultaan revered the Muslim *ulmaa* saying that these are of the sages, of my tribe who take us out of wickidity to guidance. He also respected the *yoogiis* saying that they are austere and indigent. He did not look to the defects of any sect but only saw the qualities each possessed.

He was so sharp and sagacious¹ that every hard case which the learned could not solve was referred to the king for resolution. One of these is that during his reign a woman because of a quarrel with her co-wife, killed her own young son at night and threw it into the house of the co-wife. Upon the morn she went to complain to Sultaan seeking justice for the misdeed of the co-wife. Sultaan assigned the case to the learned. When they were unable to resolve it, Sultaan first asked the accused co-wife alone in privacy: "If you have really killed this child, tell me the truth and I'll forgive you, else I shall order you slayed."

She replied, "Say what you want, I do not know anything about the killing of this child."

Sultaan said, "If you have not committed this crime, take off your clothes and go naked to the men of your house, so that they know you are free of this accusation."

The woman blushed and said, "Your killing me is a thousand times better than that immodesty. The allegation itself is a shame for me; I would never endure the immodesty."

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 151.

Sultaan let her go, and summoned the woman who had made the accusation. Her too he asked in privacy, "Tell me the truth, if you have killed the child?" She replied accusingly, "If the co-wife has not killed this child, kill me instead of her." Sultaan said, "If this claim of yours is true go naked to the assembly." The woman immediately accepted and sought to take off her clothes.¹

Sultaan prohibited her and said to the assembled, "The resolution of this crime is that she herself killed the child and put the accusation on the co-wife." A few lashes were given to the woman and she admitted her foul deed. Sultaan punished her.²

[The description of Zainulaabdiin continues: Joonaraaja, who died in 1459 CE, had written about Zainulaabdiin's reign upto 1450 CE, approximately; the rest is described by Shriivara in his continuation of Raajataranginii, Book I, Chapters I-VIII. In the remaining three books Shriivara describes the reigns of Haidar Shah, Hasan Shah and the first two years of Muhammad Shah's rule. Whole of Shriivara's Raajataranginii is an eyewitness account.]

-
1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 152.
 2. This tale is an interpolation by the Persian translator. Joonaraaja relates three cases showing Zainulaabdiin's incisive judgment - the case of water-nut cow, the case of forged *burza*-deed and the case of cow with bent horns. Unlike the fables told of say, Rinchana or Shahaabudiina, these are practical, believable cases. The case of co-wives is not in the original account of the reign by Joonaraaja.

RAAJATARANGINII

of Shriivara Pandit

Book I

Among the general inclinations of the Sultaan was that he did not order slaying of the thieves. Instead, wherever a thief was caught, he ordered that his feet be chained and he be made to carry stones and be given food.¹ Out of kindness, he prohibited hunting so that animals were not killed. He did not eat meat during the month of Ramzaan.

When the news of his munificence got broadcast, peerless musicians and singers came from the surrounding areas to Kashmir. With the abundance of these artists Kashmir became the envy of Iraan, Iraaq and Koharaasaan.² Lutist Mulaa Oodii, the direct disciple of Khvaaja Obdul Kaadir, the famous author, came from Khoraasaan unto Sultaan. He played the flute with such expertise, that the king was overjoyed. He patronized him and awarded him much. A vocalist Mulaa Jamiil, who had no second in versification and singing, often sang in the royal assemblages. Sultaan cheered all the time and was very happy. He gave so

-
1. The original account of Shriivara says this of the thieves who were farmers (RTS, I: I: 38). The provision of food is in respect of thieves who lived by thievery (RTS, I: 2: 39).
 2. This is not in the original; the Persian translator is clearly commenting on his own.

much money to Mulaa Jamiil that he was distinguished among all. Beauty of Mulaa Jamiil, like the good name of Sultaan, is famous in Kashmir to this day.¹

During the rule of Sultaan, there came a fire-worker (*aatashbaaz*) named Habiib, the like of whom the world had never seen. He made such innovations in fire-crackers that people were left stunned. He introduced gun into Kashmir. He produced feats before Sultaan and displayed skills, which could not be reproduced. He instructed the people. Besides the fire-works, he was adept in sciences too. Sultaan wrote the book of questions and answers with his aid. People have benefited from the study of the book.

Sultaan's assemblages were filled with singers and musicians, unique in the world in beauty and voice, astute in movement and gesture and adept dance and deportment. Male and female dancers and strummers living in his time bewitched all who witnessed their performances. Some of the singers were so adept that they played a tune in as many as twelve variations. The Sultaan ordered that musical instruments like flutes, *rabaab* (psaltery, a stringed instrument), *biin* and others, of every section he liked, be bought for money and adorned with jewels.

A wise one, named *Soom* [Nathasooma]² who composed poems in the language of Kashmir and was peerless in the knowledge of *Hindi* [Sanskrit], wrote a book titled *Zaina Charita* describing the affairs and exploits of Sultaan, giving all details there. Another learned one, Yoodhabhatta lived in his reign who memorized the whole *shahnaama*. He produced a book in musicology, *Zaina Naattaka*, dedicated to Sultaan; he read it before the king and obtained great benedictions.³

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 153.

2. The original text says that he was 'versed in vernacular and Sanskrit literature' RTS, I: 4.

3. The translator has confounded the original account of Shriivara, which says that Yoodhabhatta composed the drama (*naattaka*) titled *Jainaprakaasha*, in which he gave an account of the kings's life (RTS,

Sultaan was very fluent in all languages like Persian, Hindi, Tibetan and others¹ and spent money on them.² He ordered that most of the books be translated into Arabic and Persian³ and got the books on astronomy, medicine and Hindi to be copied i.e. translated into Persian.⁴ Those dealing with beating mercury (*kushtani siimaab*) and preparing elixirs, he himself translated into Persian.⁵ He ordered Mahaabhaarat, the famous epic of Hindus to be translated.⁶ The work Raajataranginii, containing the account of kings of Kashmir and which has been got translated by Jalaaludiin Akbar⁷, had also been Persianised during the reign of Zainulaabdiin.

I: 4: 38). It was Bhattaavtaara who, he says, had read not memorized, *shahanaama* and had written *Jainavilaasa* (RTS, I: 4: 39). Shriivara does not speak of any work called *Jainanaattaka*.

1. This is not stated by Shriivaraa, though his account tells that he was acquainted with Persian (RTS, BK I, chapters VI, V). Of course, he knew Sanskrit and Kashmiri. 'Hindi' of the Persian translator would mean Sanskrit. Tibetan is a fancy flight of the Persian translator, without any basis, even indication, in the original account.
2. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 154.
3. The Persian translator appears to make the translations into a sort of crusade. This is not correct. There is no mention of any works being translated into Arabic (RTS, BK I, chapter 5). Shriivara tells that books were also translated into Sanskrit. In fact, the only translation actually known to us from this marathon endeavour is Shriivara's translation of Yuusuf Zulaikha from Persian into Sanskrit titled *Kathaa Kootuk*.
4. Shahmiiriis were not Mogols. Though non-Kashmiriis, they came from the hills of North Punjab. Zainulaabdiin was a 5th generation immigrant. He knew Persian and may have learned Arabic, too, though there is no mention of Arabic in Shriivaras work. But his original tongues were Sanskrit and Kashmiri to which Shriivara attests amply. The Persian translator writes as if Persian were the king's mother tongue.
5. The original account of Shriivara does not anywhere say that the king did the translations (RTS, I: 5: 82-86). This is probably a misreading of Shriivara saying: Even the *Yavanas* can comprehend mineralogy, chemistry and *kalpa*, if studied in their own language (RTS, I: 5: 84). This hints that the translation into Persian was for these immigrants from Iran/Persia, not the king who understood Sanskrit well (RTS, I: 5: 100-1).
6. The original account does not say this (RTS, I:5: 84-86).
7. Three lines of titles and laudations of Akbar and his progeny, here, have been left out.

Contemporary Muslim kings hearing of Sultaan were curious to meet him. Abu Sayyid Sultaan specially sent fresh horses and lofty camels to him as presents. Sultaan was very pleased at this and dispatched matching quantity of saffron, *qataas*, *naafa*, shaals, glass pots¹ and other wondrous objects of Kashmir to Khaaqaan Sayyid. Sultaan Bahool Loodhii, Baadshah of Dahlii sent many precious things and Sultaan Mahmuud of Gujarat sent fine cloths, palate and other objects to Sultaan. They thus maintained a high level of contact amongst themselves. Likewise, the rulers of Mecca, Giilaan, and other realms sent him presents. The king of *Mandu* [Manddavya Gauda] who was descended of *khiljis* [khalashya]² sent him horses and fine articles hard to describe and a *qasiida* in praise of Sultaan. The Sultaan was not so gratified with the precious articles, as with the *qasiidah*.³

When *Dagarasiia* [Ddugarasiih] the Raaja of *Gavaaliyar* [Gopalpuur]⁴ heard of the Sultaan's interest in music, he sent him two or three authoritative books on this art.⁵ Later when Raaja Karatsiya took his father's place, he saw in Sultaan a father-figure and maintained the ancestral amity. Raaja Tibet sent from the famous Maansaroovar lake whose water do no change, two rare *animals* [birds]⁶ called *raaj hans* (swan), which were very beautiful. Sultaan was highly pleased at seeing these birds. The birds had the unique quality that if mixture of milk and water was put before them⁷, they separated water from the constituent of milk

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 155.

2. RTS, I: 6: 10

3. The Persian translation reverses report. Shriivara says that Sultaan Zainulaabdiin sent Khalashya 'a poem composed by himself in his own language' and that Khalashy was not so gratified by the gifts as by the poem (RTS, I: 6: 11-12).

4. RTS, I: 6: 13

5. It was 'a book named *Sangiita Chudaamani*' (RTS, I: 6: 15).

6. Shriivara does not say that the king of Tibet sent these birds (RTS, I: 6: 20).

7. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 156.

and drank what was the pure milk. Sultaan witnessed this and confirmed that what was said of them was true.¹

As mentioned afore, Sultaan at the beginning of his reign had appointed his younger brother Muhammad Khan his lietenant and heir. When Muhammad Khaan died, he appointed his son Haidar Khaan in place of his father and assigned the affairs of state to him.²

He trusted his two milk-brothers named Masuud and *Sheera* [Shuura], much. The two fought. Shuura killed Masuud who was his elder brother. Sultaan killed Shuura too, in avengement.³

Sultaan had three sons.⁴ Aadam Khaan, the eldest of the three, was disreputed in his father's eyes. He favoured the middle son Haajii Khaan, much. He had given large *jaagiirs* to him and the youngest son, Bahraam.⁵ He raised a person called Daryaa from the common ranks and gave him the title Daryaa Khaan. Entrusting the affairs of the kingdom to him, Sultaan became

-
1. What the Persian translator 'confirms' is not in the account of Shriivara, who only speaks of their breeding and the sight of the birds floating on the water of the lake (RTS, I: 6: 21).
 2. The Persian translator has mixed the accounts of Joonaraaja and Shriivara in this description. Muhammad Khaan's death is one of the last things mentioned by Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 966). Joonaraaja, however, does not speak of the appointment of Haidar Shah, which the translator has added, here.
 3. This detail is from Joonaraaja, who does not say that the king killed Shuura, but that he permitted Masuuda's brother Vinna Tthaakura to take revenge; Vinna then killed Shuura (RTJ, *sh.*, 891-94).
 4. Joonaraaja says that the king had four sons born of the two daughters of the king Madra (RTJ, *sh.*, 857) who were named Aadama Khaana, Haajii Khaana, Jasaratha Khaana and Baharaam Khaana (RTJ, *sh.*, 858). Shriivara, however, speaks of only three sons and does not mention Jasaratha (RTS, I: I: I). probably, the fourth son Jasaratha had died young. There is a folk legend among the Hindus of Srinagar that the son Zainulaabdiin outraged a certain maiden, who put a *shaapa* - curse - upon him and he died of that.
 5. Joonaraaja (RTJ, *sh.*, 857-58) does not speak of any favourites. Shriivara says that the king loved both equally. (RTS, I: 1: 2-3). Neither Joonaraaja nor Shriivara speak of *jaagiirs*, which the Persian translator has added here.

assured on the count and busied himself in ease and luxury.¹ The day his minister Shriyaa Bhatta died, Sultaan distributed a crore of Kashmiri coin, equivalent to 400 *ashrafiis*, among children on his count.²

During the time when Sultaan had obtained great proficiency in the science and practices of *Joogiis*, he one day entered the chamber and emptied his body and the spirit of *Joogii* entered his body.³ The knowers came to realize this from his ability to know the unknown.⁴ Sultaan's lack of adherence to a single religion came of this fact.

Sometime later, the princes fell out. On the orders of his father Aadam Khaan the eldest son went out of Kashmir. Mobilizing his army, cavalry, infantry, gunners and archers, he conquered Tibet and brought countless tribute to Sultaan. Pleased, the Sultaan bestowed much benefaction on him and sent Haajii Khaan to Loohar Koott. He kept Aadam Khaan under his own watch on account of Haajii Khaan's dissonance. Some miscreants presenting this in a wicked light caused Haajii Khaan to disobey Sultaan's orders till he set out from Loohar Koott for the city of Kashmir. Sultaan first sent him advisories to prohibit his coming. Since he was not dissuaded, the Sultaan finally went to the plain of Pakahal with a huge army to fight him. Though Haajii Khaan finally repented his hideous act and wanted to submit to Sultaan, his soldiers did not permit him to do so and entered the battle field.⁵ Famous captains from both armies were killed. Aadam

1. Before speaking of Shriya Bhatta's death, Joonaraaja speaks of the death of king's brother Muhammad Khaana, who he says was killed openly murdered by one of his own family, who had been exiled by the king and had returned on pretence (RTJ, *sh.*, 966-67). The translator has omitted it, while telling of Daryaava Khaana which precedes it.
2. The deaths would have occurred around 1459-59 CE as these are the last notings by Joonaraaja.
3. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 157.
4. Shriivara does not say this. It could be a misreading of Shriivara saying that the king was an accomplished *yoogii* (RTS, I: 1: 52:-54).
5. The Persian translator is telling only half the tale. Shriivara details that his captains had first advised him not to rise against his father, but he

Khaan displayed his valour in the battle field in ample measure. The battle went on from morning till sunset. Finally Haajii Khaan could no longer hold out.¹ His army defeated, he fled towards Heerapuur.² Chasing them, Aadam Khaan put most of the fleeing to sword. He did not want to stop anywhere till Haajii Khaan was captured, but Sultaan kept him back.

Haajii Khaan taking the remnants of his army went to Tabdiiz [Chibh]³ and began treatment of the wounded. Sultaan returned to the city. He built a tower with the skulls of the enemies and ordered the imprisoned soldiers of Haajii Khaan to be killed.⁴ He assigned the soldiers of Kamraaj to Aadam Khan. Aadam Khaan enquired about the groups who had sided with Haajii Khaan. He tortured them together with their families and imprisoned all miscreants. Thereupon, most of his soldiers left Haajii Khaan and joined Aadam Khaan. After this event Sultaan appointed Aadam Khaan heir apparent. For six years Aadam Khaan ruled with authority.⁵

Coinciding with this⁶ a famine so severe broke out in Kashmir that people offered their lives for a piece of bread and thieves, leaving gold and silver untouched, stole cereal. Countless mendicants and destitutes all over died of eating unripe fruit. Many of the starving subsisted on rice-husk and relished it. At this circumstance, the Sultaan⁷ was perpetually sad and stumped.

did not listen to them (RTS, I: 1: 96-99). Later, when the king came out to confront him, he wanted to submit but these military men held him back (RTS, I: 1: 133-38).

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 158.
2. Shriivara gives 28 i.e. 4528 LE (=1452 CE) as the year of the battle (RTS, I: 1: 167).
3. RTS, I: 1: 167
4. The second part of the sentence should come first.
5. i.e. was the man incharge of affairs.
6. The Persian translation is incorrect. As per Shriivara, the preceding fight took place in the year 28 i.e. 1452 CE (RTS, I: 1: 83) while the famine came in the year 36 i.e. 1460 CE (RTS, I: 2: 7-8).
7. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 159.

He distributed all his stores of grain among the people, till the calamity passed away. Sultaan fixed the revenue at one-fourth at some places (and) at one-seventh at others.

When Aadam Khaan sacked the realm of Kamraaj, he inflicted various oppressions and degradations upon the people there. He took away all he could from the people. Countless people persecuted by him came to Sultaan for redress. He did not obey any of the commands the Sultaan sent him. Gathering a huge army, he decided to attack the Sultaan and occupied Kutubudiin Puur. Affrighted, the Sultaan assured him of many concessions and sent back him to Kamraaj. To get rid of him, he sent a letter to Haajii Khaan summoning him post haste.

Around that time the Khaan, leaving Kamraaj, went to Suyapoor. The ruler of that area appointed by the king came out with his army, fought Aadam Khaan and got killed. They sacked Suyapoor and razed it to dust. Hearing of this, the Sultaan sent a huge army to attack Aadam Khaan. The two fought so fiercely that not a single person or spot was spared. Famous warriors of Aadam Khaan got killed. During their retreat, the bridge over Vyath at Suyapoor gave way and three hundred warriors of Aadam Khaan got drowned.¹

Enraged, the Sultaan issued out of the city, went to Suyapoor and comforted the people. The Sultaan camped on one side of river Vyath and Aadam Khaan on the other. Meanwhile Haajii Khaan, on Sultaan's summons, reached Baarahmulah through the Punchh route. The Sultaan sent his younger son, named Bahraam Khaan, to receive him. The two brothers expressed great affection for each other. Aadam Khaan was dismayed at the entry of Haajii Khaan. Affrighted, he fled through Shah Tang (Shalla Tteeng) and went to Niilaab. Sultaan returned to the city with Haajii Khaan. Showing great affection for him, he appointed him heir apparent. He remained sturdy in the service of king, day and night. Not a moment passed without him being in obedient attendance. He

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 160.

made up for his earlier lapses and got so ensconced in Sultaan's heart that the Sultaan was never without him being present.

Haajii Khaan interceded for the soldiers who had accompanied him during his journey in Hindustaan. Sultaan favoured each one of them and allotted them appropriate posts and *jaagiirs*. He bestowed on Haajii Khaan a sword-belt of gold, adorned with jewels, which pleased him much. Sometime later, the Sultaan was angry with Haajii Khaan on account of his incessant drinking and not following the father's advice. Then, Haajii Khaan suffered from diarrhea. Worried over him Sultaan suspended the campaign.

Secretly, without the Sultaan's permission¹, the *umraa* (lords) called Aadam Khaan. Aadam Khaan came and met the Sultaan. His coming or not-coming made no difference to the king. He showed him no favour and, dismayed with his sons and *umraa*, was greatly upset. The two (younger) brothers joined and, showing respect to Aadam Khaan, got together. Sultaan's well-wishers said to him, "The kingdom is getting undermined. You should assign the kingdom to whichever of your sons you deem capable." The Sultaan did not accept (the advice) and left the issue to God.

Factitious elements became the associates of the brothers. Bahraam Khaan saying sly things to his elder brothers brought them to enmity and rupture of promise. Affrighted of his brothers, Aadam Khaan took leave of the king and went to Qutubudiin Puur.² Meanwhile, weakness overcame the king and, his condition having worsened, he ceased to eat. Fearing trouble, the lords and ministers did not let the sons visit the king. To assure the people, they displayed the king from some elevated spot, observed the formalities, beat the royal drums, and thus kept up the state aloft. Well armed, Haajii Khaan and Bahraam

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 161.

2. As per the original account, he had sought the protection of king, who finding him unable to protect himself, rebuked him and sent him away (RTS, I: 7: 62).

Khaan, wanting to dispose off Aadam Khaan, battled with him on a daily basis. Sultaan's ailment increased on hearing of this and he became unconscious. Physicians were unable to cure him.¹

When the Sultaan had been unconscious for a day and night, Aadam Khaan came alone from Kutubudiin Puur to visit him.² Keeping the army in the vicinity of the city for protection, he spent that night in the Sultaan's court.³ One of the lords, Hasan Kuchhai, took the oath of allegiance to Haajii Khaan from ministers and *umraa*, on the same night.⁴

Next day, the lords took Aadam Khaan out of Kashmir by deception⁵ and quickly summoned Haajii Khaan, who entered the court and, capturing the stable of the king, took over everything.⁶ Gathering a huge army he camped outside the fort. He wished to visit the king but was apprehensive of the opponents and did not enter the palace.⁷ Aadam Khaan, learning that Haajii Khaan had taken over, left Kashmir through the Taarabal route and set out for Hindustaan.

Meanwhile, his servants getting disheartened left him. *Abana Paddar* [Abhimanyu, the Pratihaara],⁸ who was one of the confidant

-
1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 162.
 2. As per the original account, it was Haajii Khaan (RTS, I: 7: 193).
 3. The original says: He passed one night secretly in a house at the outskirts of the capital (RTS, I: 7: 194-95).
 4. This is a misreading of the original account: In the meantime, Hassana, driven by self-interest and deceiving others, took oath to Shrii Haajii Khaan and sought his shelter (RTS, I: 7: 196).
 5. The original only says that had Aadam Khaana killed the guard and captured the stables that night the things would've been different (RTS, I: 7: 199). There is no mention of his being taken out by ministers, which the Persian translator has added.
 6. The Persian translator is not correct. Haajii sent the treasurer (Hasana) and his brother to capture stables (RTS, I: 7: 200).
 7. This description of the Persian translator is at variance with the original, which says: Haajii Khaan with his army remained that day outside the palace afraid of a rising, and though he was anxious to see the king he could not do so (RTS, I: 7: 203).
 8. RTS, I: 7: 206.

lords of Haajii Khaana, pursued him with a force. Fighting hard, Aadam Khaan killed Abhimanyu's brother and intimates and went away.

About that time Hasan Khaan, son of Haajii Khaan, who had been in Punchh came and joined him. Haajii Khaan was much reinforced with his coming. With each passing day he gained sway and his army increased. Sultaan died at the age of sixty-nine. His reign lasted fifty-two years.¹ Lord's is the eternity and king's the country!

1. Though Shriivara does say (RTS, I: 7: 221), that he ruled for fifty-two years, till his death in the year 46 (4546 LE = 1450 CE), the year of his accession given by him (RTS, I: 7: 224) is 96 (4496 LE = 1420 CE) which makes it only 50 years.

RAAJATARANGINII

of Pandit Shriivara

Book II

Sultaan Sikandar the second¹ a.k.a. Haajii Khaan, sat on the throne, three days after his father's death² and got the title Sultaan [Haidar Shah] and put that very title on his seal.³ On that day, he did many acts of benevolence. He feasted the learned and the wise ones and beat drums of joy. A golden plate was laid at Sikandar puur, now known as Navhatta, for him to stand. His brother Bahraam Khaan and son Hasan Khaan remained in attendance and put the crown on his head.⁴

He gave Kamraaj as *jaagiir* to Hasan Khaan and Naagam to Bahraam Khaan. Entrusting the charge of state affairs to Hasan, he made him heir to the throne. He gave gifts and horses to Raajas who had come for condolences and congratulations. To every

1. This honofic is not in the original; it has been added by the Persian translator. Save for his persecution of Hindus which equaled his grandfather, there is nothing in this king, infamous as an inveterate drunkard, to deserve honorifics. like Joonaraaja, Shriivara does not use title '*sultaan*' for the kings whom he calls *rajna* or *bhupati*.
2. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 163.
3. The Persian translator has misread the original: By an order under his seal, Haajii Khaana now declared his name to be Haidar Shaha (RTS, II: 3).
4. Shriivara: "The treasurer Hassana distributed money as ordered and put *tilak*, the mark of royalty, on his forehead with offerings of gold and flowers" (RTS, II: 8).

one of other persons he gave adorned sword-belts. Though he was unrivalled in generosity, he was not forgiving. He was after avenging every small lapse, anyone may have committed. Because of that, most of the lords went away to remote places.

He was careless of the state affairs. His ministers oppressed the people in whichever way they fancied. A barber named Poonii [Purna]¹, becoming his favourite, attained great power. He took bribes from people. Whoso he was unhappy with, he talked ill of him to Sultaan; believing his words, the Sultaan immediately ordered him to be beaten, slain or sacked.

He was so addicted to drinking that (he took to drinking wine brewed from)² molasses, (and the molasses) the bye product of sugar³, used for brewing wine became scarce in Kashmir, and was very costly in comparison to white sugar, sugar and pure *shakar* (brown sugar). Around that time, Sultaan grew mistrustful of Hasan Kuchhay who had endeavored first and the most for Sultaan. He called him in private, along with seven other persons from the trusted lords of his father and with the help of Poonii had them tonsured, tortured and killed. He confiscated their properties. Thereupon, he became the object of hatred of his *umraa*.

Before this event, Aadam Khaan, taking a large army from Jammu had reached Punchh to battle with Sultaan. Sultaan kenning his coming to have been the result of his summoning by the aforesaid lords had got them killed. Hearing this, Aadam Khaan returned to Jammu and joined Maanik Deeva, the Raaja

1. RTS, II: 61

2. These words must be added to complete this half finished line (images 164 last line, image 165 first two lines). The original report is different: In his reign, owing to the prevalence of drunkenness wine came to be prepared from molasses as from grapes, and this wine became as common here as the wine prepared from sugar in other countries. When the king became addicted to this wine and averse to all other kinds of enjoyment, molasses and candies and all other things prepared from the juice of sugarcane became scarce (RTS, II: 54-55).

3. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 164.

of Jammu, to fight Mogols who had entered his realm. An arrow struck him in the mouth there and he died of that hurt.

Coming to know of this news, the Sultaan was much aggrieved at the death of his brother. He had his body brought from battle ground and buried him in the vicinity of his father's grave. He mourned him for some days and Bahraam Khaan getting very apprehensive, served him in amiable manner and kept watch of his own safety. People had agreed to put him on throne.

Meanwhile, Sultaan had sent Hasan Khaan with a huge army¹, on foreign conquest. He was busy, fighting fierce battles in Hind, and collecting much loot and goods, when he heard that Sultaan had fallen sick due to excessive drinking and the kingdom has got deranged. (And that, the ministers, lords etc. have)² joined Bahraam Khaan. On this account, he returned to Kashmir with a huge army. Sultaan, influenced by the factious, was angry at his coming without summons. Hasan Khaan's services were not acknowledged and he was not allowed attendance.³

One day Sultaan along with a party of his intimates went to the sparkling chamber and began to drink. In intoxicated state his

-
1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 165.
 2. This or some like part, which should've been there to complete the sense, is missing leaving the sentence incomplete (image 166, line 3).
 3. The original account of Shriivara, who had accompanied Hasana, is different on many counts:
 - a) Hasan's return was not linked to Aadam Khaan's death.
 - b) The developments had little to do with Aadam's death and burial.
 - c) Bahraam Khaana had gained sway.
 - d) Hasana met the king on return, but later the king grew apprehensive and did not show his affection to Hasan (RTS, II: 163-66) Haidar's fall and disease came later (RTS, II: 168-69).

foot missed and he fell.¹ His head and face were injured, and he died of that hurt. His reign lasted one year and two months.

(Book III of Shriivara's Raajataranginii dealing with the coronation and rule of Haidar Shah's son and successor, Hasan Shah, is missing in the Persian text of the Munich Manuscript or *intikhaabi taariikhi kashmiir*. The account jumps from Haidar Shah to his grandson Muhammad Shah, the son of Hasan Shah without speaking of Hasan, in a single line (image 166, line 9). the part may have been missing in the Sanskrit texts being translated, or got dropped in the first translation. This is further indication that Badaayuunii, who rehashed Shah Muhammad's Persian translation of the Sanskrit chronicles, did not consult the original Sanskrit texts. The translation of Jogesh Chandra Dutt, edited by S L Sadhu² and collated with shlookas of the original Sanskrit text given by Shrikanth Kaul by this author (R L Bhat), has been added here, to supplement the account. It would also serve as an illustration of how detailed and objective the Sanskrit chronicles are.)

-
1. This is a much constricted and variant version of the original account of Shriivara (RTS, BK II verses 168-73): as if urged by death, the king ascended to the top of the palace along with his servants to indulge in drinking. 168. There, running around in sport in the cabin called *pushkara*, the king fell down and bled from nose (II: 169). The servants joining arms carried him to the bedchamber of the place, but he swooned and lay upon the bed like a mirror having lost its reflecting power (II: 170). Ignoring the trusted physicians of the king, a certain *yoogii* tried on the king his medicine which was strong on account of its poison and caused him pain (II: 171). The king's body became excessively hot and he, getting no respite, wished for death (II: 172). For three days, the prince along with the minister Ahmada remained with the king in the place (II: 173). This is followed by the exertions by minister Ahmada offering the kingship to Bahraam Khaana with the condition of making Hasana the heir-apparent which Bahraam refuses haughtily (II: 175-81), the struggle for succession and Bahraam Khaan's flight; the same situation which he had brought upon Adam Khaana befell him at night (II: 182-200). And then the death of the king, which apparently took place days later: on the 5th day of Vaishaakha, in the year 48 the king went to *svarga*, having ruled for one year and ten months (RTS, II: 201)
 2. S L Sadhu, 1991, *Medieval Kashmir*, Atlantic Publishers, New Delhi.

RAAJATARANGINII

of Pandit Shriivara

Book III

Hasan Shah (1472-84 CE)

I bow to Shiva who is the sole lord of the three worlds, and who has attained the rank of an immortal god and freedom from endless pain. The poet, the lord of *yoogiis*, who has given an account of the past in his work, is worthy at the present time to receive our reverence (*III: 1-2*)¹.

Coronation

King Hassana, whose mind was free from evil intention, left Shekandharapuri, the town of his father, and went to the superior and finer city of Jainanagara built by his grandfather. Seated on the throne, clad in elegant robes and ornaments, he gladdened the earth and looked beautiful even like the rising moon on the eastern hill. Malik Ahmada Yukta himself applied *raaja tilaka* on his forehead, and adorned the new king with flowers of gold. Royal Fortune, as if recognizing him as the sole remnant of his dynasty and the ornament of the family, protected him by placing him on the silver throne, and covering him with the royal umbrella. Looking at the moon-like face of the new king, the face of the city, which was like the lotus expanded! (*III: 7-11*)

1. The numbers in brackets are *shlooka* of Book II of Shriivara's Raajataranginii (RTS, III: 1-2).

The smoke of *boma* at the king's *abbisheeka*, rose high in the air, as if the earth sent her breath upwards in gladness and looked brigh. (III: 12) Learned in the six schools of philosophy, the king having freed himself of envy, combined the different *kriyaas* of the six *darshanas* in himself (III: 22).

The new team

The king then made his minister Mallika Ahmada Yukta the undisputed master of Nagrama and villages attached to it. His son, Navruja Yukta, did the work of *Dvaarapaala* and became powerful on account of his possession of villages and wealth. He enjoyed the lordship of the country of Ikshika. (III: 24-25)

Tajibhatta had served the king when the king was a boy and in a foreign country; and he was loved by the Malik, and was greatly beloved of the king; he bestowed on him the post of an envoy and he (Tajibhatta) was to the king like the tongue of his kingdom. Formerly the stream of power had flowed by hundred channels, then two, but now it rested in Tajibhatta. Others too, like Joonaraajyanka, soon obtained villages and favours according to the services they had rendered previously. (III: 27-30)

In all things the king acted as Shrii Malik Ahmada, advised and he did not disregard this minister, even as the sea, though agitated, does not overflow its shore. It was by the advice of this minister that the king liberated those who had been hostile to his father and grandfather and had been imprisoned in Bhutta country. The king, who knew all *darshanas* and who placed his intelligence under the guidance of his minister, re-established in the kingdom the practices of the time of his grandfather. (III: 31-33).

He performed the work of the king even at the risk of his life, and his devotion to the king, as to Mahaadeeva, was unmoved. He made a good use of his wealth by laying *matthas*, *agrahaars* and *sadans* (inns/sheds), exercising of hospitality and by serving the king. (III: 36-37)

Bahram returns

Meanwhile, Bahramakhana, giving up his attempts to conquer foreign countries, and puffed with arrogance, came to make war. The king's officers had written to him promising to join his army at the time of battle, and this made him hope for success. Formidable at the head of his army he came from the interior of Karnaaha, scaled the mountains and, with a view to usurp the kingdom, arrived at Kramaraajyapura. At that time the king with his ministers was staying at Avantipura; but on hearing of his (Bahramakhana's) arrival he soon retraced his steps and came to Suyyapura. (*III: 39-43*)

Filled with anxiety at the return of his uncle, he called together all his ministers and sought their counsel. They advised different lines of action. (*III: 43-51*)

When the king heard these various and uncertain views, he settled the plan of action according to the advice of Malik Ahmada. He kept with him the troops of his father and grandfather, and sent Faryaddaamara, Tajibhatta and others, with the troops of his uncle (Adamakhana) and with his own troops, in order to fight Bahramakhana who was in the Mavari country (*III: 52-54*).

Bahraam captured

Bahraamakhaana hoped to overcome this small army, and hastened to Ddulapura. "But though the nobles of the king had held out hopes to Bahramakhana they did not come to him, and he considered himself betrayed by them, and became despondent. On that day Royal Fortune remained as if in doubt between the two, the uncle and the nephew (*III: 55-57*).

But when the king arrived at Jainagiri bent on prosecuting the war, messengers came to him and said: "O King! Bahramakhana did not act wisely in rushing to war, together with his son; like a mad elephant he has been captured in battle. Bahramakhana was thrown down in the field of battle, and was deserted by his servants, even as a tree in a garden is forsaken by leaves in the month of *Pavsha*. (*III: 59-62*).

“It was owing to thy greatness O king, that Shiraala the Maargapa, and other servants and warriors of Bahramakhana perished. It is strange that none of our army died, but the arrows discharged by our men pierced the scabbard of the Khana and he was unable to draw his sword; his condition pitiable, and he was surrounded by our soldiers. The soldiers came up to him and attempted to kill him, but Firyaddaamara in his mercy promptly saved him by sheltering him within his arms. The earth was full of mud, and there was an excess of rain, a Brahamana was before him, and in his helplessness and fear of death what miseries did he not feel. (III: 65-69) He remembered that what his father had said had come to pass that day, and he blamed himself for battle, as if he was born again. What more need be said? Order speedily what should be done to Bahraama.” When the king heard of this he was glad and gave rewards to the messengers. (III: 70-76)

Bahram blinded

They brought Bahraama Khaana and his son befor the king. He was bereft of ornaments; his turban was soiled with blood. The people saw Bahraama Khaana and his son bound before the king (III: 77-82).

(*Sblookas 83-96*: tell that all Zainulaabdiin had said to Bahraama regarding what would befall him in future, had come to pass.)

The king was afraid of relations of Avatarasiha and others, within a few days, sent them to prison in his anger. That wicked Mallikataja, born in Panchgahvar, secured royal favour by flattery and became a source of misery to men. The whole country was deceived into bribing him, and he robbed the country in order to amass fortune. Abhimanyu, the *Pratiibaara*, obtained the lordship of Deevasara (III: 97-103)

The king, whose intellect was yet immature, became angry with Bahraamakhana, and ordered his eyes to be put out. Bahrama's eyes were accordingly covered with cotton, and this unworthy descendant

of Jainaraaja caused a hot iron rod to be applied on them for their destruction (*III: 106-107*).

...Bahraama's feet were bound in iron chains, and he remained imprisoned and blind, (*III: 115*).

He suffered agonies for three years, his body became a skeleton, and he died in that condition (*III: 123*).

Intrigues unbounded

Cruel Abhimanyu, the *Pratiihaara*, was puffed up with vanity for having performed some acts of prowess and could not bear the powerful faction of the ministers (*III: 125*)... The *Pratiihaara* went on devising plans to get rid of the minister Mallika Ahmada, and the Mallika also secretly entertained hostile feelings against the *Pratiihaara* (*III: 127*). At last, on one occasion when the king was proceeding to his palace at Vijyeeshvra, the minister induced him to cause the *Pratiihaara*, who did not mistrust the king, to be arrested within the palace. Abhimanyu himself was known to fame, but his sons Pandava and others were unworthy as jackals (*III: 128-29*)...

Then the *Pratiihaara*, with his sons, was brought in a boat by Tajibhatta, bound and bereft on his wealth, and thrown into prison (*III: 131*). Within a year his eyes were put out (*III: 132*).

Malik Jaada punished

Some one falsely reported to the king that Malik Jaada intended to bring forward the son of the blind Khaana and usurp the kingdom. When the king heard this, he ordered the despised one to be imprisoned after confiscating all his property (*III: 142-43*).

No one pitied him in his misfortune, for he had oppressed the people by exacting bribes and money (*III: 145*).

The barber Purna and Mallika Jada and others spoilt of their riches, died after long imprisonment (*III: 148*).

Sayyids expelled

Knowing that Sayyida Nasira and his people were born of the family of *Paigamvara* and that they were men of great accomplishments, and had come to adorn his kingdom, and were deserving of honour, the king Jaina had given them very high seats in the court, had shaken hands with them, and assigned to them estates in the kingdom. But now Sayyida Jyamala and others of that family were known to the present king as turbulent chiefs. He accordingly exiled them from the country, and confiscated their hoarded treasure. (III: 149-53).

The Sayyids enjoyed many large estates, and by their marriages with the king's daughters had lived like kings for a long time. They now wandered about hither and thither; some of them went to Dillipura, and others, owing to their advice, did not leave the country though exiled, but remained like bee in the month *Maagha*. These foreigners, who used formerly to live on the refuse of grains, had become rich after coming to this country and had forgotten their previous history, even as men forget their previous life on coming out of the womb. They oppressed the people, and owing to the weight of that sin, they were despoiled of their wealth and were exiled by the king; and they lived in fear of their life fish taken out of a lake. (III: 154-59)

Alliances among leaders

The Malik formed alliances by marriage with the Raajaanaka people, and with the Tthakkuras, and the Maargapatis; and for the sake of Taajibhatta retained in his hand the possession of all the offices of the great kingdom. He thought to himself that Taajibhatta belonged to his family and was adopted as his son. Jyahaangiira, the *Maargapati*, found that his sister was slighted by the Sayyida, and he drew up a deed for the divorce. At the request of the wise Mallika the king caused the elder sister of the *Maargapati* to be given to Taajibhatta (III: 160-64).

The people remarked that while king Jaina could not banish the Sayyids, his grandson had done it with ease (III: 168).

Erection of buildings

When the country was rid of these thorns, the king, with the approval of the Mallika, engaged himself in erecting buildings; and his courtiers were also similarly engaged. The people were happy under the good administration, and they occupied themselves in marriages and festivities, in building good houses, in dancing and processions and they thought of nothing else. The king built in the year 50 (1473-74 CE) a beautiful palace at Didamattha, on the banks of the river, unmindful of expense (III: 169-71) The architects made wooden figures of Garuda and placed them on the corners of the building (III: 174). The queen mother Goolkhaatoona was like the former queen Dida, and she also built a large religious edifice called the *madrassa* (III: 175).

(The king) built a *khaanagaha* within the town for the benefit of his father's soul. The king renewed the palace that had been burnt by fire on the banks of the river at Kuloodharana Naaga and made it beautiful. The old palace on the banks of river at Vijyesha was renewed, and owing to its excessive brightness, it looked like the central jewel of a necklace. (III: 177-79).

Constructions by the nobles

The minister Ahmada Yukta built at Didamattha rows of buildings unmatched in beauty; and near the great stone wall which surrounded the court-yard of *masodahajrah*, and beautifying it, he raised a religious edifice, the celebrated *khaanagaha*, where many travellers come from various countries. (III: 184).

His wife Shaha built a *mattha* for religious purpose, on the road leading to *Kheerii*, and gave alms when it was completed. His son minister Navruja Yukta too built a new religious *mattha*, and constructed a stone causeway from the town to Kshiptikaa (III: 187-88).

The two other brothers named Rigaka and Nuuthaka, who were worthy of praise, built two *matthas* in Kramaraajya, beautiful

as palaces. Taajibhatta, who had become rich and great on account of the king's affection for him, built a *mattha* at Jainapuri in Karaala country, and erected a new edifice of stone at Kudadeenapuri. (III: 190-92)

Matthas and vihaaras

Edarajanaka, master of the royal wardrobe, built a *khaanagaba* inside Balaaddyamattha, and a new *vihaara* in his native land. The *mattha* was built by the side of the funeral ground and was adorned with apartments for the accommodation of wearied travellers. He constructed rows of buildings – *mattha*, *agrahaara*, *masjeeda*, *vihaara*, – and altogether erected twenty or thirty buildings in the kingdom. Firyyaddaamara built a Jainapura a well-proportioned *khaanagaba*, and a *mosodahujrah* beautiful on account of its extensive yard, and he spent one *koti* on the occasion of the first entry into these edifices, giving *dakshina* according to all *shastras*. Hayaatakhatoota, the beloved the king, and radiant with wealth, repaired the *mattha* at Mrigavaattaa which had been burnt down; and elder queen Moomarakhatoota built a new *mattha*, at Jainanagara with her own money near the palace.

The barber, Pherathakkura, was an officer of the king, and the works of piety which he built, like the yard of *masodahujaraha*, adorned Jainapura. He was bent on doing good deeds, and built a beautiful *mattha* across the river at Vijayeesha. Sayyabhaanddapati built a *vihaara* at Vijayeeshvara, furthering the path of Buddha *dharma* and *sangha*. His brothers Lakshmamera and others, chiefs among merchants, built a new stone temple of Bhiimasvaami Ganeesha. The faces of the *mlechchas* became dark and were bent down, as if at the sight of that high white-washed temple of Ganesha. Others also erected various buildings high and low, and the country was covered with them, and looked like heaven. (III: 193-206)

New coin

The king found that the *dinnaras* of Shri Toramana has ceased to be current, and he gave currency to the new coin, *Dvidiinnarii*, which was impressed with the image of *Naaga*. The old copper coin was twenty-five (*dinnars* in value), but owing to the dearth of articles its value had become somewhat reduced. (III: 211-12)

Death of Hasan's mother

Goolkhaataana, the king's mother, died suddenly (*III: 214*).

She favoured the customs of the Hindus as the light of the sun favours the lotus; and all men thought of her, lamented and wept for her. (*III: 216*)

After he had grieved for seven days, Mallika made the king wear a white dress, and money was spent on the occasion, and he caused the king's sorrow to abate. The king ordered a large new bridge of boats to be built at the extremity of Shahabhadinapuri with his mother's money so that her righteousness might increase in merit (*III: 218-19*).

Birth of heir-apparent

The queen Hayaatakhaatoona, born in the family of the Sayyids, was beloved of the king, (*III: 220*)

A prince was born to the king by this great queen and he was named Mahmadaakhaana, a name worthy of the *Mausulas*. The king, happier than before, entrusted his boy to Taajibhatta for being brought up, (*III: 224-25*).

Festivities

In the month of Vaishakha, in the year 54 (1477-78 CE) the king held a festival on account of the birth of his son and a large sum of money was spent (*III: 226*)

The youthful king, on whom Royal Fortune was propitious, brought in men expert in singing and enjoyed music (*III: 230*)

Great actors, skilled in acting, and graceful like so many moons placed in a row, excited in the king a desire to see their performance. Jesters were like fun personified, with their hanging breasts and artificial beards, with the movements of their teeth and brows, with their jests and antics, their laughter, and the laughter of their eyes, expressive of various emotions, and with their cries mimicking the cries of animals (*III: 232-34*).

Malla Hassana, more skilful than his father, first invented the delightful lute with ten strings. I held up the gourd-lute, by the order of the king, and showed my skill in vernacular and in Persian songs.¹ The king who was fond of traditional songs² was well-versed in Sanskrita poesy and he repeated the following *shloka* in praise of music, setting it to music: "The power of music renovates withered trees, subdues the lower animals, and makes the gods descend to woods and speak unseen; in sorrow and pleasure it gives joy to the ignorant and the learned, to the young and the old alike; may such music abide with me"! (III: 235-38)

With a sweet voice he sang many high-tuned songs of unparalleled music and in many tunes, and surprised us. Then the great king ordered me, who am the head of a section of the music department, to introduce the singers to his presence. I brought in Vahaabadeena and others, who were superior to all, and the leaders among singers, and I named each of them and placed them before the king: Shikshakara and the others, five singers seemed to spread the influence of the god of love under the pretence of singing five tunes (III: 236-43)

The singers from Karnaatta sat gracefully before the king as if they represented the six tunes, *viz.* Keedara, Gavdda, Gaandhaara Desha, Bhangaala and Maalavaa (III: 245).

Display by actresses

The female dancers of the king shone beautifully and bright like the lamps at night. The female dancers Ratnamaala, Diipamaala and Ruupamaala danced charmingly displaying emotions and gestures. The king praised the beautiful actress Ratnamala, her forehead marked with *tilaka*, and he praised her dancing and owned that she had melted the hearts of all by her steps and her movements, by

-
1. *bhaashaabhigiit' saamaghrim paarsigiita kavshshalam...* (RTS, III: 236)
 2. *gaathaagiit...* Sanskrit *padya* (III: 237); *gaathaa* is singing connected with Vedic *padya*. This special singing is still popular among Kashmiri Hindus.

her tremor and her action (*III: 247-48*). Possessed of loveliness and famed for her beauty, she was the renovator of men! (*III: 250*)

The youthful king praised the women in presence of his boon companions, and took cups of wine from them (*III: 252*).

Duet songs

Hearing of the king's fame which was gratifying to ear, Pavaarakadana celebrated for his song, his poetry, and his music came from his distant country (*III: 254*). Skilled in singing duet songs, he once sang a duet song named *liila* in the vernacular before the king. The king did not understand it, and asked me of its features which, I at once explained with illustration from *Bharatashaastra* and others. When the king had heard the six verses sung in a beautiful voice, he became anxious to hear more. (*III: 256-58*).

Pavaarakadana hesitated while I sang aloud, and the king remarked to me that he (Pavaarakadana) was vain on account of his abilities, and directed me to debate the subject of music with that musician. And when the discussion in the assembly had been closed by a reference to books on music, and when he (Pavaarakadana) heard me speak about duet song, he expressed his wonder, and exclaimed that the Kashmirians were wonderfully skilful people, knowing all the *shastras*. He said so, and embraced me and freely acknowledged me his preceptor (*III: 259-61*).

Shriivara honoured

When the king found me thus victorious in the discussion, he was pleased, and favoured me (*III: 262*). He has given me strong and swift horses, and thick yageopaviit, and other beautiful articles beset with gold and jewels; and he has also given me beautiful boats with sails, and robes from his own person, and wealth. (*III: 263-65*)

Desecration of customs

Whenever the people of this country forsook their old customs owing to religious changes, or amassed money by practicing deception, they were generally punished by calamities such as storm

and conflagration, excessive cold and snowfall, hostilities and diseases (III: 269).

Once upon a time, some merchants of the city, who were the favourites of the *Mavsulas* but had followed the customs of the Hindus from their birth, killed cows in the city.¹ But when these wicked men had eaten the flesh of the kine, the part of the city where the animals had been slaughtered caught fire as if to purify itself, and the *vihaara* there also was in flames. Then the terrible south west wind began to blow and brought unbearable troubles in the country (III: 269-72).

When these calamities overtook the people a *pandita's* son meditated for some nights on the strange and baneful wind and composed this *shlooka*: "Afflicted by clouds that bear the tint of fire, by the sun that has the hue of the moon, and by the powerful south-west wind, whither, O people, will ye flee!" (III: 273-74)

Fire engulfs Jyaama Masjid

In the year 55 (1479-80 CE) a fire suddenly broke out at one end of the cow market at Pravareeshapura. Extending its devastations to the left bank of Maarii up to the Gulikavaattika in a trice, the city was consumed and looked like a burnt forest. From the *brihat masjeeda* the flaming barks of the *bhurja*, carried by the wind, came rushing, like messengers of calamity, to the place where the Brahmanas and mendicants are fed (III: 275-77). The *masjeeda* was a spacious building, extending on all sides (III: 278)

It was here that the *yavanas* chanted *mantraas* and looked graceful, like thousand lotuses with humming bees. It was here that on Friday, worshippers issued from the four doors on the four sides, so that it

-
1. Among the Hindus of Kashmir is a sect living and accepted as Hindus in all respects, yet some unfathomed 'slur' has always lain with this clan. Various folk legends are current among the general populace about the clan, all of which are clearly speculative. All of them, however, point to their having suffered a 'pollution' of sorts, in the past centuries. Could this particular event, noted by Shriivara, explain the straits of this clan of Hindu merchants?

seemed as if the countrymen who had been buried were coming out!
(III: 280-81)

In a moment, the fire, all destroying like the fire at the end of a cycle, left nothing but the walls. Thousands of houses were burnt on the day in the herdsmen's quarter in villages, cities etc., on account of the destructive wind. One hundred fowlers perished that day in the waves of the Mahaapadma Lake, agitated by the boisterous wind. The planet Mars predominated that year, and caste rules were not strictly observed, and the presiding goddess of the city was exiled from her house (III: 289-91)

Jealousy among ministers

A kingdom where the seven conditions¹ are favourable, expands in strength and becomes prosperous. But if in such a kingdom mutual jealousies exist among the principal ministers, then it melts away within a short time, even as the body withers when attacked by three diseases. The authorities should guard against such mutual jealousies, and then they need not fear foreign foe, even as an atheist fears no God. Ministers, who violate the above maxim of king Lalitaditya, excite mutual jealousies and perish. It was on account of the quarrel amongst Mulaa Eesaaka, Daryaava Khaana and others, that Shri Jaina's kingdom went to pieces through mutual disagreement; and from that time when Shri Jaina found his kingdom ruined, no minister had ceased from being jealous of others (III: 296-300).

The minister Ahmada Yukta, though well versed in the science of government, became fickle-minded. Once Navruja and other sons of Ahmada unable to brook the prosperity of Taajibhatta, privately accused him before their father (III: 303-4).

They also alleged that the guardianship of the prince in the palace had also been given to him; and that these circumstances have concurred for their ruin (III: 306).

1. The king, ministers, citizens, the capital city, the treasury, the armed forces and the *shaastra*

When his sons said these things, the Mallika regarded Taajibhatta with jealousy, and was angry with him, though he had been adopted as his son (*III: 308*).

Mallika devised various plans intending to do mischief to Taajibhatta (*III: 311*).

Accordingly, he spoke of the enemies surrounding the kingdom and insinuating that since 'no one takes heed of that' asked the king permission to lead the attack. As expected by Ahmada Yukta, Taajibhatta's gallantry was challenged and he offered to campaign against the enemies, (*III: 312-14*).

When the king heard this, he, by the advice of the Mallika, furnished Taajibhatta with an army, and sent him out of Kashmira. Taajibhatta's servants followed him with great din and noise, in fear and in gladness, even as black bees follow their chief (*III: 315-16*).

Taajibhatta's campaign

When the king of Raajapuri and others saw the costly and well-equipped army, adorned with royal insignia, they were wonder struck; Jyabhadeeva and the men of the Madra country. The people of Madra, of small stature, were pleased at the approach; they became unruly, left their ruler Taataarakhaana and came to him. Taajibhatta created confusion in Taataarakhaana's country by burning down *masjeedas* which had been built by the Khaana at Shrigaalakoota and other places. He reduced the herdsmen of Purapatana, until their power existed in name only, and his own prowess became irresistible like that of the sun (*III: 317-21*).

He reduced many petty chiefs to vassalage, and performed many deeds of courage and serverity, and thereby instilled terror in the celebrated kings of Ddilli and other places. He soon returned to his country with wealth and horses (*III: 322-23*). Deceived by fate, and unable to brook the prosperity of Taajibhatta, the Mallika resolved on humiliating his pride (*III: 325*).

Apprehensive of the love all gave him on account of the king's affection for him, Mallika caused the king to be jealous of him. At this time the king's little son named Hoossana was (taken away from Taajibhatta and) made over to Mallika Navraja to be brought up. Taajibhatta was returning with his troops when he heard of this disregard of the king's obligation towards him, and he felt his influence diminished. When he arrived with his army, the fickle-minded king did not accord him due honours. The Mallika, however, was unable by his own endeavours to do any injury to Taajibhatta, and he accordingly planned to bring back the Sayyids who had left the country (*III: 327-30*).

Ahmada dispatched letters to the Sayyids in the county of king of Dilli (*III: 332*). Sagacious men remarked that since the Mallika was bringing the Sayyids back after having once done them injury, they would eventually cause his ruin (*III: 334*).

Opposition to Sayyids

When Firyaddaamara came to know the purpose for which the Sayyids were being brought back, he went to the house of the minister Ahmada, and spoke these sensible words: "Taajibhatta is under your power, he conducts himself towards you like your servant; you should therefore protect him, and subdue his pride by means of good advice. Do not bring back the Sayyids, the Turushkas Pushkala, Ashvasa, and others; they are strong and are like thorns to the country; and they have once been expelled with difficulty. You are bringing them back to destroy one man, but when they come all will be destroyed (*III: 335-38*)."

After he had gone, the minister did not abandon his project of bringing in the Sayyids (*III: 343*).

Sayyids return

When the Sayyids had thought over the minister's letters, they became anxious to return; they collected their party, and came in like swans. First, their chief Meya Hassana, accompanied by Navruja Yukta, came to the king. After befitting mutual eulogies, Mallika

became favourably inclined towards him, and bestowed on him his own estate Khooyaashrama. The same Sayyida Hassana, who could not even enter the country before, was now, for the destruction of the Mallika, in a position to pass orders on others. Gradually the Sayyids entered the country in great numbers, and spread themselves over the kingdom; and the people of Kashmira, those who were in the country and those who lived in the outskirts, became alarmed (III: 345-49).

Sayyids intended to throw Taajibhatta into prison in order that they might rob his wife. Taajibhatta heard that these people were planning to do him mischief; he became alarmed, and came to the house of the Mallika. By this time the minister had perceived the influence which the Sayyids had acquired, and had become alarmed. At this period the old Firyaddaamara died (III: 352-54).

Urged by the Sayyids, the king became angry with Taajibhatta when he heard that he had taken shelter with the minister, and he immediately sent Joonaraajanaka, and other soldiers in order to arrest him. He also ordered that Taajibhatta should be confined in his own house, and his property confiscated. The Mallika gave up Taajibhatta and he was kept under confinement. Though he was confined in his house, he lived with his family, like a swan in the Mansa Lake (III: 356-59).

Yukta weakened

All the powerful men were ruined by Mallika Ahmada who could not bear the welfare of others. the offices of power had All been given to the men of Mallika's party. People were afraid of Mallika. The king became estranged with Mallika and rarely gave him audience. (III: 361-63)

Accompanied by the Sayyids, the king went to the garden by the side of his palace, to enjoy the sport of flowers. After he had enjoyed the sport, he got into a boat and, in the company of the Margesha and Navruja, gave himself up to drinking. They all became

intoxicated, and talked on various topics, and, like the members of the family of Yadu, they hit one another with the arrows of words. When the excitement became great, the king left his turban in anger and went to the house of the Mallika in order to rebuke him. Efforts were made to propitiate him, but the king returned to his palace angry, and grief for the indiscretion of his son (Navruja) touched the minister's heart. (*III: 365-69*)

On another day the king, whose heart was estranged from Ahmada, privately told the minister's enemies of his unreasonable determination not to protect any more the party of the minister. The enemies of Ahmada took advantage of this opportunity. They advised the king to take away from the minister the charge of bringing up Yoosoobhakhana and to give it to some one else; for what would the king do, they asked, if the minister set up the prince as the king of the country. The king agreed and soon after he gave the charge of bringing up his child to Joonaraajanaka, and thus artfully took away the Khana from the Mallika. (*III: 370-73*).

Clash within the palace

The minister remained in his house on the morning of the day in which he made over the prince to the king, and he said to his wife that he would be revenged on his enemies. In the meantime the Maargapati had been sent for by the king and, impelled by the idea of doing some bold deed, he came from his estate to the city, accompanied by his soldiers. When Mallika heard of the Maargapati in the morning, he became angry and went to the king attended by his soldiers, though warned by (evil omen of) the cries of kites to his right (*III: 374-76*).

The Maargeesha Jyahaangira was ordered by the king to enter the court-yard with his soldiers. The sun was then rising, and its beams were reflected on the weapons. At this time the minister also entered the yard of the palace, and there the two met and challenged each other, and the capital trembled in fear of these two chiefs. The king surprised that the minister had entered the palace armed, became angry and caused Bhangila to support Jyamsara the Margesha. Sent

by the terrified king, Bhangila came, and after having barricaded the palace arrived with the Sayyids. The victorious Jyahangira had joined Raajanaka, and released Tajibhatta from confinement; and he then marched into the yard of the palace (*III: 378-82*).

The soldiers sent by Taajibhatta were eager for fight and they set the western gate of the palace on fire. The fire consumed rows of houses upto the residence of Hassana within a short time and reduced them to the condition of a burnt forest (*III: 383-84*)... When the affrighted king saw the fire burning in the yard of the palace he was overcome with terror, and his soldiers, though eager for fight, could not engage themselves in it (*III: 387-88*).

Ahmad imprisoned

When the Mallika saw that on account of his son's haughtiness his followers had deserted and that his son was left alone, he did not know what to do (*III: 389*).

He felt disheartened and sought the shelter of the king who was in the palace directing the movements of the guards. The king thought of the previous services of the minister and received him with affection; so that those who had sought to do harm to the minister found that the king was on his side. They therefore found no opportunity for commencing hostilities, and went away to Bhutta country. At this time the honourable Jyahaangiira, always eager for victory, entered the king's yard with shouts by the north gate of the palace. Jyahaangiira and other worthy men were pleased to see the king, and they were happy at the triumph achieved. Urged by these men, the king threw the Mallika with his sons and several into prison on the following morning. (*III: 393-99*)

Royal fortune returned from the house of Yukta to her own residence. The hoarded silver and other metals which the enemies of the king had obtained by oppressing the lower classes of the people and the Kaayasthas now came to the possession of the king. (*III: 400-402*)

Mallika Ahmada had administered wisely, and when he was thus destroyed with his sons, wicked people acquired influence with the king. (III: 420)

Sayyids who held offices, oppressed the people, even as painful diseases oppress the body. On the pretence of taking "flowers of joy" and "dinnara pieces,"¹ the Sayyida officer began to acquire riches at the expense of the subjects. Shri Meya Hassana got the title of Malla which had belonged to the Mallika, and likewise obtained the Mallika's village of Naagraama and his estates. He divided his new estates among his sons and servants, and gave half of the wealth and estates to Meya Mahmada. (III: 421-25).

The Sayyids became unruly after their triumph. They placed the king under their control. they sent messengers and brought in the able Sayyida Naasira. When he arrived at Panchaladeva² by the Surapura road he was attacked with fever, and in that state he entered the capital (III: 426-27). He passed two days in fever and died in his house (III: 429).

The imprisoned Mallika, alarmed at the banishment of his son, was overpowered by grief, and he fell ill and died (III: 430).

Sayyids tighten hold

It was owing to the good luck of their daughter (the queen) that the Sayyids obtained wealth and greatness; but they regarded the people of Kashmira scarcely even as grass.³ The king, bent on furthering the interests of the Sayyids, acquiesced in orders that were issued by them for their own selfish ends. They were busy in creating factions, the king was forbearing and women came to have great influence. It was apparent that some upheaval was at hand. (III: 433-35)

-
1. *Aanandapushpa diinnara khandda* (III: 422).
 2. *Panchaal Deeva* (III: 427) is the original name of the mountain range which has been Persianised to *Piir Panchaal*.
 3. *Saidah Kashmiirikaan sarvaan na trinaaya api agii ganam* (III: 433).

Accepting bribes was considered by the officers of the state as a virtue, oppressing the subjects was regarded as wisdom, and addiction to women was reckoned happiness. All opposition ceased. Meeya Hassana was proud of being able to accomplish whatever his heart desired, and he oppressed the whole kingdom. (III: 436-37).

Jyahaangiira's warning

The Maargapati apprehended mischief from the Sayyids but he was clever in protecting himself. He returned to the king's dominion but avoided coming before the Sayyids. (III: 445-46)

Once when Jyahaangiira found the king alone, he thus said: "These Sayyids, O King! were once exiled but have been brought back. You have yourself brought this curse on this peaceful country. As the grand-son of King Shri Jaina, you have a right to the kingdom: but so has his daughter's son, Meya Mahammada, a similar claim on the county. Always suspected (of being ambitious) the Sayyids have further been encouraged by the Turushakas with hopes of support. Such are the Sayyids and they should always be feared. They are ever eager for the kingdom as vultures are for meat (III: 447-49).

"All your work, O King! will be accomplished if you avoid placing yourself under the influence of your wife. Do not, therefore, O master! be influenced by your spouse. I am going away for the safety of your kingdom as well as of myself. The country is ruined, and you ought to save yourself somehow." (III: 451-52)

When the king heard this he said, "So will be". But when he went to his wife at night he was overcome by affection and he told her all that had been said to him. Whereupon the queen, who had espoused the cause of her father's party, became enraged, and like a fearful she-serpent, sought to do injury to the Maargapati (III: 453-54).

Rising from the side of his beloved, the king became anxious to favour her party and placed the kingdom in their power. (III: 456)

Jyahaangiira leaves

The Maargeesha feared mischief from the Sayyids on account of the hostile queen and he, with his troops, went away by the Karkotadranga road, took away with him all his relatives and property through Bhangila. (III: 457-58)

When the Maargapati had left the country, the sky suddenly began to scatter snow. The king's court became desolate without him, even as the *kumuda* flower withers in the absence of the moon. (III: 465-66)

Women take bribes

The king remained indifferent to the doings of his servants, his mind was influenced by his wife and the Sayyids, and his own acts became disorderly and reprehensible. Unable to enforce his orders in governing his own country, he disliked ability in others and liked only to watch the looks of his beloved women. (III: 468-70)

These women were quick in inflicting punishments and bestowing favours on men, and were eager in accepting bribes and they, not the ministers or the servants, became the intimate friends of the king. The Turushkas, Pushkala and Ashvasa, who had given up even the observances of decorum in the enjoyment of pleasures, now gained their own end, not the end of their master. (III: 471-72)

Jyahaangiira's message

The king remained in bed day and night and mourned for the Maargapati and others for whom he was grieved, but was unable to bring them back. The Maargesha had taken shelter in Lohara, he was oppressed with anxiety for his master, and he took this opportunity to send the following words of advice by means of a letter. "O king! O Jewel among men! Your treasury, which used to gratify the hopes of all, has been removed by the Sayyids, and they have brought in abject poverty. (III: 475-77)

"Meya Hassana's mind is under the influence of evil planets, and like Ravana he keeps away from the right path, though advised by

his well-wishers to follow it. The woman named Meera, who accepts bribes as plentifully as she takes meat, is abiding with you for your ruin. Let the Sayyids remain with you if you so wish it, but I will go." (III: 482-84).

When Meeya Hassana came to know of this letter, he soon replied in the presence of the king, hissing like a serpent in his anger. "Exiled from his place and deprived of his livelihood, surely the Maargapati will be withered by our prowess, even like a lotus torn up and taken from the water. (III: 488-89)

Madras retained

When Parashuraama and others, of the country of the Madras, apprehended danger in Kashmira, and asked the permission of the Sayyids to depart. But the Sayyids said that they would allow them to go after providing them with provisions for the road; they were told to stay a few days, and their salary was promised to them. But when the Sayyids returned to their houses, they said to one another that these Madra people were hostile like the Turushkas, and that they should not be allowed to depart. (III: 498-500)

Sayyid tyranny

The Sayyids were fond of hunting, and in the month of *Maagha* they took with them the king. Wherever their oppressive army encamped at night, there the cries of the oppressed people resounded on all sides, and wherever the king's army halted, the people complained bitterly against the uprooting of the vines. (III: 502-3)

On the top of a hill there were some deer whose bodies were covered with snow. They came down in herds. Sayyids were glad to see them (III: 507).

All the people of the place asked the king repeatedly to cease hunting, urging that the gods would be angry at the destruction of the deer of a hill inhabited by holy men (III: 509).

The *muni* named Vaishravana had his seat on this hill; he came to the king and pleaded that the place was a pen for the deer and kine

of the hermitage, and begged that it might be spared. The female deer, struck while crying and weltering in blood, were killed by the relentless Sayyids; and the ground was filled with fetuses from their womb (*III: 511-12*).

The king was not satiated with killing some animals; he denuded hills of deer; in the evening, he ordered the forest beaters to occupy the houses of the villagers. Some of these men, , passed the night in houses where the owner's daughter-in-law and daughter and wife were young and beautiful, and there were wine and meat and fish. (*III: 513-14*)

Turushkas seated themselves in the houses of Brahmanas: they ate from the vessels of the Bahmanas the cooked meat of fowls; and they gave themselves up to the pleasure of drinking. The inhabitants of the place were robbed of their domestic animals and rice and wine and other things; the avaricious servants of Sayyids killed the people in their own houses. The impotent king heard the people express their wish that he might not come there again. (*III: 515-18*)

Cruel sport

Certainly, in the present instance, it was killing men under the pretence of killing beasts. If to tie down and kill hundreds of deer be sport, what then is a butcher's work? The skill in taking aim from horseback on running animals is to be coveted, but what praise is due to the practice of tying up animals and shooting them with arrows? (*III: 519-20*).

Killing and extirpating the deer in this manner, the king at last reached the hill on the side of the Mahaapadma Lake. Sin was thus committed which will strike terror into hunters in future times. (*III: 522*)

After hunting, the king returned to the capital suffering from diarrhoea. Some said that it was owing to the sin committed in the pursuit of game that the gods were angry. Others said that the Sayyids, urged by a desire to obtain independence and the kingdom, and instigated by the Turushkas, did something to the king to cause the illness (*III: 523-25*).

Surrounded by the Sayyids, the king feasted by the festivity in Sarja, and gave audience to all, as if he would not see them again (III: 533).

Last days

The king returned: he left the Sayyids, and went to his bed, informing the queen of his illness and telling her that he was not well (III: 536).

The king told Meya Hassana that he would not live long, that his infant sons were not fit for the kingdom, that the son of Bahraamakhaana would not allow his sons to remain safe. "Rather" he said, "bring the son of Adamakhana by some artifice, and coronate him. Or do as your daughter, the queen advises." (III: 540-41)

The queen Meera Mukhata when alone with her father, thus said to him: "It is doubtful whether the king will live; what should be done now. Coronate the son of Bahraamakhaana, and make your eldest grandson the heir-apparent." When Meya Hassana heard this he rebuked her in anger. (III: 543-45)

Death of Hassan Shah

All the females who knew the king went to see him, but they prevented others from going to him, and did not allow those who charm away poison to chant *mantras*. They did not follow the advice of physicians and themselves prepared pills for the king to take. The king exclaimed that some mischief had been done to him. (III: 547-48)

When these female doctors found his voice and complexion changed, they brought in physician Ruyyabhata. (III: 550)

The attendants asked the king why he was gazing on. The king, then, on the point of death, replied by ordering the removal of that *sanddoo* (buffalo) from his sight. All then burst out in loud lamentation and said that the king had seen the buffalo of Yama and would go to heaven that very day. The king's voice stopped, his eyes watered and rolled, and on that very night he was on the point of death. (III: 551-54)

In the year 60 (1484 CE) on the ninth day of the dark noon, in the month of Vaishakha, the king went to heaven after having reigned for twelve years and five days (*III: 546-54*).

[End of Shriivara's Book III, omitted in the text of the *Munich Manuscript*. Translation of the rest of the Persian text continues.]

RAAJATARANGINII

of Shriivara Pandit

Book IV

Sultaan Muhammad Shah,¹ son of Sultaan Hasan Khaan, ascended the throne at the age of eight² with the aid of Sayyid Hasan. At the time of his crowning articles of gold and silver, armaments, etc., were brought before him. Except for a few, he was not attracted by any. He took the bow and held it. Observing this bent of his and deducing his predilection from it, those who were present said that he would be interested in army and battling and that there would be much fighting in his reign.

Sayyids became so powerful during his rule that no minister of Sultaan's father was left as could go near the Sultaan.³ Kashmiris

-
1. This is the last book (Bk IV) of Shriivara Pandit's Raajataranginii. The translator leaves out Book III which described the reign of Hasan Shah. The account of Muhammad Shah begins in the middle of the page (MM, image 166, line 9) which tells that it is not a case of missing folios in Munich Manuscript. Had the pages been missing in the copy from which this manuscript was copied, the copier would've noted it. Either the Book III was missing from the collection, presented to Akbar or was omitted by the first translator, Shah Muhammad.
 2. 'aged seven years' (RTS, IV: 3).
 3. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 166.

were chagrined at this state of affairs.¹ Aided by Parashuraam, who had taken refuge in Kashmir from Taataar Khaan², the Kashmiris united and attacked Sayyids in revenge. They craftily killed Sayyid Hasan, along with thirty of the leading Sayyids in the Nowshehra garden.³ A great turmoil arose in the city. The dissidents crossed the river Vyath and camped there. Sayyid Muhammad, son of Sayyid Hasan, the maternal-uncle of Sultaan, came with a large body to the Sultaan's palace to protect him.

That very night while this conflict raged, a person named Iidii Raina took Yuusuf Khaan son of Bahraam Khaan out of the prison, wishing to take him. when he saw that behind him there was fire and opponents stood ahead, he was stunned.⁴ By chance one of the Sayyid lords, named Sayyid Alii Khaan, came to know of it and killed Yuusuf Khaan. He also killed Taazii Bhatta, [Paaja Bhatta] who objected to killing Yuusuf Khaan.⁵ His mother Sobaan Deevii, who since his imprisonment had been on

1. Unfortunately, the Persian translator not only cuts out details from this crucial eye-witness account but also alters the purport of the account. In Book III, Shriivara detailed how the Sayyids had oppressed Kashmiris. They had been turned out of the valley, to the great public relief, but were brought in due to the palace intrigues. against Hasana's will, Sayyids enthroned of Muhammad Shah to complete their stranglehold on the power in Kashmir. This was greatly resented by ministers and the people. It must be remembered that Hindus still constituted a major chunk of the population of the valley.
2. Shriivara tells that Parshuraam and other wanted to leave but the Sayyid did not pay their salaries and did not allow them to leave (RTS, III: 498-50). The original account does not speak of Taataar Khaan; it is the Persian translator's addition.
3. The original says Amritavatta, Anantbhavana, near Vichaar Naaga (RTS, IV: 35).
4. The actual report of Shriivara (Bk, IV) is: When the son of Baharaam Khaana saw the soldiers of the enemies before and the fire behind, he was like a young deer, unable to either advance or to stay. (Sadhu, page 219). The Persian translation is a confused summary of the original account.
5. The original account says that Sayyid Alii, 'gave the prince an assurance of safety' and took him to his home where 'Meera and her servants' beat the prince to death. Paaja Bhatta tried to save the prince and was also killed. (RTS, IV: 76-82).

perpetual fasting eating no more than three mouthfuls of coarse bread, kept the body of her son in her house for three days and lamented over it, before letting it be buried. She built a chamber near her son's tomb and died there.

When Sayyid Alii Khaan heard that the enemies planned to cross the river Vyath and mount an attack, he destroyed the bridge. Sayyids camped on this side of the river. They gave the soldiers money and horses¹ to recruit shopkeepers and skilled workers for army. Hordes of Kashmiris came from parganas and villages to join the opposite camp. The fighting intensified. Countless people got killed, on a daily basis. Thieves and dacoits openly pillaged the city. *Saadaat* dug trenches around the city to stop incursions. They burnt the dissident's houses in the city and villages and laid their properties and chattel out on the roads for anyone to take away. Out of hauteur, they themselves looked down on these goods and did not deign to take them.

Meanwhile, the rebels wrote to Jahaangiir Maagree and called him from Loohar Koott. Charging down, Jahaangiir landed at Qutubudiinpuur, which was near the rebel camp, in three days. *Saadaat* sent him a conciliatory message. He did not accept it. Then, Jyahaangiira and Saif Ddaangar, a commander, reputed to have crossed the bridge and waged a fierce war on *Saadaat*. Two sons of Jyahaangiira and most of the rebels got killed. Much pleased, *Saadaat* beat the drums and erected high minars with the skulls of the slain rebels. Had they pursued the rebels, and crossed the river that day, they may have overcome them. Since the fates did not so ordain, this plan did not occur to them.

Next day, they wished² to cross the river and subdue the rebels. The opponents assembled on the other side. A fierce battle ensued upon the bridge. The bridge gave way and a large number of people from both sides fell into the river.

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 167

2. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 168

Saadaat wrote a letter to Taataar Khaan, the ruler of Punjaab and called him to aid them. Taataar Khaan sent an immense force to Kashmir. When the army reached Bimbar, Raaja of that place, named Bhoodhan [Bhooddanaraaja]¹ fought them and killed all the warriors in the army. Rebels were much pleased at hearing of this.

For two months, the battle between *Saadaat* and the rebels continued; betimes this group prevailed and at the others, the rebels. Finally the Kashmiris broke into three groups, crossed the river and occupied the surrounding hills. *Saadaat* stayed put and fought them. Displaying great valour and fighting spirit, they fought without giving any hint. For one day and one night, the killing fires raged between the contenders and people ran into the blaze with abandonment.

Since the rebels exceeded in numbers and ammunition, they prevailed. Most of the leaders of *Saadaat* got martyred. The rest fled. Kashmiris chased them away and entering the city sacked it.² They set every *mohala* and habitation they entered on fire. The *khaanakah* of Sayyid Alii Hamdaanii was gutted in that conflagration and collapsed. The count of those killed on the day³ reached two thousand.⁴ This event occurred on 892 HE.⁵

After this event, Sayyid Alii Khaan and Sayyid Muhammad son of Sayyid Husain took refuge in the house of a person named Gadaayir, of the Raavas clan [Gadday Raavatra].⁶ Kashmiri rebels gathered and went to attend upon Sultaan Muhammad Shah. Allying him to themselves, they threw Sayyid Alii Khaan, along

1. RTS, IV: 217

2. The original says: Remembering that Sayyids had burnt Rudravihaara, the enraged *margapatii* set fire to Alaavapura (RTS, IV: 315).

3. As per the original account, this is the total number of soldiers killed in the war (RTS, IV: 332).

4. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 169.

5. This is incorrect. It computes to 1487 CE, whereas Shriivara states (RTS, IV: 332) that these events occurred in the year 60 (4560 LE= 1484 CE) i.e. the same year king Hasan died (RTS, III: 554).

6. RTS, IV: 339

with other Sayyids, out of Kashmir. They gave huge monies to the aforementioned Parashuraam along with the men from Chanbuu¹, and saw him off to his place.

Every one of the Kashmiris claimed headship and dissension emerged amongst them. The administration in the kingdom broke down. Meanwhile, Fatah Khaan son of Aadam Khaan came from Jaalandar, after the death of Taataar Khaan, on Jahaangiir Maagree's summons, to claim his ancestral kingdom² and reached Raajoorii. For a long time, he stayed there. Since he was the direct grandson of Sultaan Zainulaabdiin, lords and commoners went there in horde after horde, to call on him. He bestowed gifts on each one of these and comforted them. He hoped Jyahaangiira Maagree would come and meet him. Jyahaangiira was apprehensive, because his rivals had gone and met Fatah Khaan, and prohibited him from the conquest of Kashmir.³

Suddenly Sultaan Muhammad Shah, on Jyahaangiira's instigation, exited Kashmir⁴ and camped at village Koosoo with a large army, and Fatah Khaan too passed in through Hu'ru'puur route.⁵ He reached the vicinity of Aadavan and, leaving a spring

-
1. Chanboo or Chanbuu is the Persian translator's interpretation of the original which says 'Madra' all though. Here the original says 'own country' (RTS, IV: 345).
 2. The Persian translation is totally incorrect. Shriivara (RTS, IV: 407-39) says the reverse: Jyahaangiira when he was out of Kashmir and was affrighted of Sayyids, he had written a letter to Falah Shah (RTS, IV: 407). He (Fatah Shah) came after Taataar Khaan's death (IV: 408-10). He then sent a letter to Jahaangiir asking support (IV: 424-30). Jahaangiira said that the rule had now been settled on Muhammad Shah (RTS, IV: 431-93).
 3. This is not in the original account which says that after the murder of Joonaraajanaka, his supporters has exited Kashmir and had been living at Raajoori and allied themselves to Fatah Khana when he landed there (RTS, IV: 412-13).
 4. The Persian translation is not correct. It was after a near victory of Fatah Shah (RTS, IV: 442-455) that Jahaangiira (Jyahaangiira) took the boy-king and left the city (RTS, IV: 458).
 5. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 170.

in between, came face to face with Sultaan.¹ With arrays drawn the two armies fought a fierce battle.² First Fatah Shah's army prevailed, disturbing Sultaan's army. Then Jahaangiir Maagree enforced order and put fifty of the famous warriors of Fatah Shah to sword.³ The tables were turned. There was no doubt about the capture of Fatah Shah, when all of a sudden one of his detractors shouted that enemies had captured the Sultaan. When Jahaangiir heard this news, he held back from chase. Much worried, he came unto the Sultaan. He ordered Malik Taazii Bhatta to destroy the villages that had given Fatah Shah passage.⁴ Sultaan returned to Kashmir⁵ after the victory.

Fatah Khaan laid low for a long time. He again surfaced at Beeramgala and, mobilizing a force, set out to conquer Kashmir. Jahaangiir Maagree took a huge force and camped near village Koosuu in Naagaam pargana to confront him. Fatah Shah's servant, named Ziirak, [Jeeraka]⁶ took the opportunity to pillage the city and released a large number of *amiirs* from Sultaan's

-
1. There is no mention in the original account of the invading army coming face to face with the king at Ardhavanam (RTS, IV: 448). The king was still in the city.
 2. Translation is roundly incorrect. After Jyahaangira had brought out the boy-king (RTS, IV: 458), he camped at Gusikooddara (RTS, IV: 461). He heard that Fatah was at Kalyaanpura and leaving the boy king behind, came to attack (RTS, IV: 462). The two armies came face to face at Drabhagaam (RTS, IV: 463). The battle took place there (RTS, IV: 464-74).
 3. The Persian translation is incorrect. The initial victory of Fatah Shah in which many braves of the king fell (RTS, IV: 475-82), was overturned by Jyahaangira with the rumour that he had captured Fatah Shah (RTS, IV: 480). His fleeing men returned and defeated Fatah Shah's army (RTS, IV: 489-498). The battle took place in the year 61 LE (1485 CE) at Drabhagaam near Kalyaanpura (RTS, IV: 499-500).
 4. Taajii Bhatta appears to have acted on his own in this, as per the original account (RTS, IV: 512).
 5. By Kashmir is meant the city, Srinagar. Persian historians often focus only on the capitals and forts, after the Central Asian fashion. However, the translator is misreporting; Shriivara says that Jyahaangira took the king and went to Jayaamalmarga (RTS, IV: 511).
 6. RTS, IV: 531

prison. Amongst them was Saif Ddaangar. Fatah Khaan appointed Saif his prime minister and made him the commander of his army.

Jahaangiir was much worried over the release of Saif and in desperation decided to seek peace with Fatah Khaan. He sent a message to Raaja of Raajoorii¹, with whose aid Fatah Khaan had come, to sow dissension in Fatah Khaan's army. Raaja of Raajoorii left him and other ministers too joining him, went over to Jahaangiir.² Fatah Khaan was forced to flee without giving battle. Jahaangiir pursued him upto Hurpuur. After this campaign, Fatah Khaan again went to Chanboo, sacked it and collecting a huge army again went to Kashmir.

Jahaangiir, who had thrown Sayyids out, called them back and reinstated them.³ Then Sultaan and Jahaangiir, arraying their army, entered battle with Fatah Khaan. Saif Ddaangar, on the side of Fatah Khaan so ranged over the battle field that none of the Sultaan's commanders could stand before him. Saadaat displaying their audacity fought fiercely. Most of them got martyred⁴ and the rest were hurt. A large number were flung into ditches and gave up the ghost. Sultaan and Jahaangiir came to trust and rely upon them more and more.

Fatah Khaan left Kashmir and again mobilizing a prodigious force fought a fierce battle with Sultaan, the third time round. This time none of the guards and servants of Sultaan survived. Injured, Jahaangiir fled to a remote nook. Sayyid Muhammad, son of Sayyid Husain, had crossed over to Fatah Khaan. The entire treasury of Sultaan Muhammad Shah had been expended.

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 171.
2. As per the original account, Edha Rajyanka, Riga Daaamara and Keeshava brought the king of Raajoorii to king to establish peace. Jahaangiir lured the Raaja Shringaar Singh and got him to his side. (RTS, IV: 549-50).
3. The Sayyids had been ousted a second time, within a couple of years, after the 1484 war (RTS, III: 554) between Sayyids and the Kashmiris.
4. The Persian translator may have used the word '*shahaadat*' out of the customary respect Muslim show to Sayyids. Else, it was no occasion for martyrdom.

After two years and seven months of the kingship,¹ Sultaan Muhammad Shah² and the brothers of Sultaan were captured and handed over to Fatah Khaan.³ Fatah Khaan put them in the palace with his own brothers and ordered their needs of food, drink and other necessities to be provided, as they were provided to Sultaan Muhammad. Saif Ddaangar, too, paying them due respect remained in constant service.⁴

Fatah Khaan's men sacked the city and leveled it with ground.⁵ None opposed them. In the year 894, Fatah Khaan ascended the throne of kingdom.⁶

[Here ends the 4th book of Shriivara's work, the 3rd in the series. Fatah Shah's ascending throne in 1486 followed by loot of the city is the last event described by Shriivara. There after begins the Raajataranginii of Pandit Shuka].

-
1. RTS, IV: 637 (The Persian text says 'ten'; MM image 172).
 2. There is no mention of brothers in the original account which says that the king 'was brought from Vimshapraस्था and given over to the enemies' (RTS, IV: 638).
 3. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 172.
 4. The original says that he was given a few attendants and kept under water (RTS, IV: 639). It, however, says that he now felt happier than when he had been the king (RTS, IV: 640).
 5. The original account Shriivara BK IV emphatically says that the city was not burnt down (Sadhu, page 254).
 6. The year given, 894 HE computing to the year 1489 Christian era is incorrect as the eye-witness Pandit Shriivara (RTS, IV: 637) gives the year 62 (i.e. 4562 LE =1486 CE).

RAAJATARANGINII

Shuka Pandit

Book I

Titled Sultaan Fatah Shah, the king put an end to the dissensions in the realm and enforced peace and ease. He assigned the affairs of state to Saif Ddaangar.¹ During the reign of Fatah Shah, Miir Shamsudiin, one of the distinguished disciples of the revered Shah Qasim *faiz bakhash*, came to Kashmir from Iraan. The lords and ministers of Fatah Shah, giving him total acceptance, assigned to *muriids* (disciples of) Miir Shamas the properties, land, shrines and temples of Hindus, which had been destroyed by his endeavors. His Suufiis cut down the lofty trees which were sacred to Hindus and burnt them. None of the Hindus was able to prevent these actions. Everywhere, in all places, the Muslims did what they fancied.²

1. It must be noted that Munich Manuscript or *intikhaabi taariikhi kashmiir* (ITK), the Persian translation of Sanskrit histories, does not indicate the particular Raajataranginis being translated; ITK manuscript is one continuous narration, without marking even paragraphs. Raajatarangini-wise distribution has been made here on the basis of the events described. Except for the later part of Zainulaabdiin's reign where the Persian translator has mixed the details given by Joonaraaja and Shriivar, the identification of the description with the respective RT's is clear. Shriivara was followed by Praajya Bhatta, after which Shuka wrote. However, the work of Praajya Bhatta is not available. We know him only thorough his mention by Pandit Shuka. There is nothing to show that the Persian translator had this work, as the events described after Shriivara chronicle are all taken from Shuka's work.
2. These are the first events described in the Raajatarangini of Shuka (RTSH, I: 20-28).

A severe conflict arose between the ministers and commanders.¹ Gathering their followers, they killed one another in the royal court.² Malik *Achha* [Malik Utsa] and *Shankar Raina* [Rajana Shringaara]³, the influential ministers of Fatah Shah thereafter releasing Sultaan Muhammad Khaan from prison, laid camp at Baarahmula.⁴ When they saw no courage in him⁵, they regretted their act and sought to again capture Muhammad Shah and hand him over to Fatah Shah. Muhammad Shah, with three or four men, escaped from them, leaving no trace.

Sultaan Fatah divided the realm of Kashmir into three equal parts between himself, Malik Utsa and Rajana Shringaara.⁶ He made Malik Utsa the prime minister and gave Rajana Shringaara

-
1. This line appears to be a general summary of events described in RTSH, BK I, *Shlookas* 29-51. They tell of enmity developing between the *amiirs* (RTSH, I: 29-30), the burning of Zainakadal (I: 31-33), the intrigue against Muusa Malik and his death (I: 34-38), the rise of Ibraahiim Maargeesha (I: 39-42) and the *ddaamaras* being brought in (43-51). A notable fact here is the death of Muusaa (I: 38) and his last rites performed by Ibraahiima on king's orders (I: 39). This event as per Bahaaristaan Shaahii (English tr., *ibid.*, page 108) occurred in 916 HE (1510 CE).
 2. This again is a warbled account of Shuka's account (RTSH, I: 52-64) beginning with the killing of Gajakhaana and Mallikdata by Gadayameera (I: 52) and ending with the destruction of Rajana Ddaamaras in the year 1513 CE (I: 64).
 3. RTSH, I: 67
 4. This is not in the original account of Shuka (Book I, *shlookas* 42-64). There is also no mention of Muhammad Shah's release there. The *shlookas* mainly deal with the high intrigues brought about by Fatah Shah by calling in *Ddaamaras* to oust Ibraahiima (RTSH, I: 44), the killing of Ddaamaras (RTSH, I: 64) and the return of Ibraahiima (RTSH, I: 65). At the end, Utsa and Shringaara emerged as the major players, supporting the king and turned Ibraahiima out in 1514 CE (RTSH, I: 67).
 5. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 173
 6. RTSH, I: 73. This would be the second instance of Kashmir getting parceled out among the lords and the ruler, after Shahmiir divided the kingship between his two sons, Jyamshera and Alleeshvara. It happened around 1510 CE. Thereafter, Kashmir was frequently parceled out among the warlords, with the ruler, Fateh Shah, Muhammad or their sons and scions, getting a third or fourth part or less.

the control over revenue. Malik Utsa was so incisive in resolving intricate cases that none could equal him.¹

One of these cases is that two artisans claimed a ball of very fine silk.² Each one produced the certificate of ownership. They both gave similar information about the weight, colour etc. Malik Utsa asked them whether the ball was rolled on a digit or a rag. The owner said on a digit and the claimant said 'I have wound it upon a rag'. They unwound the fibre. No rag was revealed. It was clear that he was lying. He was punished and a fine was realized from him.

Sometime later Ibraahiim, son of Jahaangiir Maagree, who had once held his father's post under Fatah Shah for a few days, went over to Muhammad Shah and brought him from Hindustaan into the realm of Kashmir. A fierce battle took place between Fatah Shah and Muhammad Shah in the vicinity of the village named Khooyihaamuun.³ First they fought with arrows. Then, they used swords. Many *sardaars* on Fatah Shah's side got killed. Fatah Shah fled through Hurupuur and went to Hindustaan.⁴ Fatah Shah had ruled for nine years.

Sultaan Muhammad Shah then occupied the throne, the second time. He appointed Ibraahiim Maagree the chief minister and Sikandar Khaan, a scion of Sultaan Shahaabudiin, the heir on the advice of Ibraahiim. The sons of Ibraahim, who were the sons-in-law of Malik Utsa (now in prison), went to the prison and killed him.

-
1. The original report is reverse: When Utsa Malik, the arbiter of all affairs took his seat in the court, people saw the meeting of a jackal and a sheep of which they had only heard. (RTSH, I: 77).
 2. Added by the Persian translator, this tale is not anywhere in the original account of Shuka Pandit.
 3. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 174.
 4. As per the original account of Shuka, the fighting begun at Varamula, proceeded to Bhavattunga (Bottjung, Soopor) to Keshanaatsa (Kuunas, Banddapuor) to Khuyaashrama and finally Nyuuva near Shuurapuor i.e Hu'ru'puur (RTSH, I: 79-92).

Fatah Shah having mobilized an enormous force again turned to Kashmir from Hindustaan. Sultaan Muhammad Shah, not summoning the strength to face him, fled without giving battle. His rule lasted nine months and nine days, on this turn.

Sultaan Fatah Shah, for the second time, captured the realm of Kashmir and established his rule. He appointed Jahaangiir, of the Paddar clan, [Pratihaara] the chief minister and Shankar Raina [Rajana Shringaara] the head of revenue and ruled with justice.¹ Muhammad Shah after exiting Kashmir² for Hindustaan went to Sikandar Khakhar³, who sent an enormous army to aid him. *Jahaangiir Paddar* [Pratihaara Jahaangiir] too, on account of certain differences, came and joined Muhammad Shah.⁴ He took him along and entered Kashmir through Raajoorii.

Fatah Shah appointed Jahaangiir Maagree [Jahaangiir Maargeesha] at the vanguard, to fight Muhammad Shah and

-
1. Names in the original account (RTSH, I: 103).
 2. The original account speaks of another attack of Muhammad Shah in the year 91 (i.e. 4591 LE = 1515 CE) at Vangil which did not succeed (RTSH, I: 113-18). It also tells of two events, one before and another after the battle at Vangil.

The first was the death of ten thousand Hindus at Gangabal. For years Hindus were prohibited from immersing the ashes of their dead. Fatah Shah allowed it and Hindus in thousands went to Gangabal to perform the last rites of their dead. On return, they were over taken by a storm and perished 'to the number ten thousand' (RTSH, I: 109-12).

After the battle of Vangil, an epidemic broke out in Kashmir, in which people died in large numbers. When the epidemic ended, people heard the news of Muhammad Shah's arrival with Sikandar's aid (RTSH, I: 119-23). The Persian translator has omitted both these events, together with wealth of other details in the original account of Shuka.

3. The original says 'Sikandar, the lord of elephants' (RTSH, I: 124). It must be Sikandar Lodhi (1488-1514 CE).
4. This is not correct. The original account, says that 'he came bringing with him the sons of Margeesha and reached the country of Raajapuri (RTSH, I: 125). They are the sons of Jahaangiir Maagree who was dead, and whose son had died at Vaangil. Shuka later tells all Fatah Shah's ministers wished for the arrival of Muhammad Shah that Kacha Chakreesha and Raajana Shringaara went to Shuurapuur to wait for the arrival of the new king and that Fatah Shah was supported by one minister, the Pratihaara Jahaangiira (RTSH, I: 130).

Jahaangiir Pratihaara. Jahaangiir Maargeesha fighting valiantly got slain, along with his son, at the hands of Jahaangiir Pratihaara.¹ When Fatah Shah found that his worthy men were slain and the remaining like Aalii Miir, Shah Bangii were hemmed in by Muhammad Shah's ministers², he was forced to flee towards Hindustaan where he died.³

After Fatah Shah had ruled for one year and one month, Sultaan Muhammad Shah, for the third time, sat on the throne of Kashmir, and beat the drums of joy.⁴

He arrested Raajana Shringaara, the notable minister of Fatah Shah, and imprisoned him. With the approval of Alii Malik, initially called Miir Aalii, he bestowed chief minister-ship on *Kaachii Chak*

1. The Persian translator has confounded the aforementioned battle at Vangil, (which he omitted) with the present war, which occurred a year later.
2. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 175.
3. With the account of Praajya Bhatta gone missing the, the respective reigns of Muhammad Shah (MS) and Fatah Shah (FS) during the intervening period (1486-1513) are not clear. The Persian chroniclers, including this Persian translation, give inaccurate years, through incorrect conversion to Hijri era. The only definitive information is given in the accounts of Shriivara and Shuka, which however is not complete, as the middle part of Praajya Bhatta is missing. This information is as follows: Shriivara writes that MS was crowned in 1484 CE (RTS, III: 554 & IV: I) and was dethroned in 1486 (RTS, IV: 637). Shuka says FS was dethroned after 9 years in 1514 CE and MS installed (RTSH, I: 93); MS was dethroned after 9 months in 1515 and FS installed (RTSH, I: 102). After 1 year and one month FS was dethroned and MS installed in 1516 (RTSH, I: 133). Three years later, FS died outside Kashmir, in 1519 (RTSH, I: 162). This is the primary and only reliable information, which tells of MS becoming king thrice and FS twice. Possibly the two lost and gained kingships for a couple of years each in mid 1490's, as suggested by Taariikhi Hasan (Persian text Vol. II, pages 212-31) but Hasan's years are not correct. Though *Taariikhi Sayyid Alii* does speak of the alternation of kingships of FS and MS it, strangely, credits MS with 52-year rule (Persian text, pages 40). The accounts of later Persian histories, *Bahaaristaan Shaahii* (English tr., pages 77-113), *Taariikhi Haidar Malik Chaadduurah* (Persian text, pages 62-67) and *Vaakaati Kashmiir* (Persian text, pages 66-77) are disjointed, hopelessly confused and all revolve around the fortunes of the warlords.
4. Shuka (RTSH, I: 133) gives the year 92 i.e. 1516 CE.

[Kanchana Chakareesha] who was the best in wisdom, unique in valour and tact and had a large clan.¹

Kaachii Chak [Kanchana Chakareesha] evinced a rugged facility and exceeding sagacity in resolving the disputes.² One amongst these is that a clerk married a woman. After some time the woman went away and married a different person. She got her father and mother allied to her side. The first husband took the case to *Malik Kaachii*. When the summoned one, who had the woman with him, was questioned he said the real father and mother of the woman, present there, had married her to him. Those present were unable to resolve the case. *Malik Kaajii* [Kanchana]³ said, "This clerk is a truthful person. The truth would be on his side". Accordingly, the Malik summoned the woman and said, "This clerk is lying. I'll give you this in writing, so that he would've nothing to do with you hereafter. Come, pour some water into this inkpot." The woman went and put one or two drops of water into the inkpot. Two or three times Malik told her to pour more water.⁴ She poured only that much water as was needed. When asked why she did not pour more water, the woman replied, "If I pour more, the ink'll be spoiled." There upon Malik said to the assembled, "Had this woman not been of the clerk, how could she have poured only

-
1. The Persian translation is incorrect; original says that Aliimiira had asked for the post (RTSH, I: 139).
 2. The tale that follows is not in the original account of Shuka Pandit (RTSH, I: 138-259).
 3. This MM-paragraph (image 176, lines 5, 6, 9, (*Kaachii*) and line 11 (*Kaajii*) illustrates the travesty of Persian script turning *Kanchana* into *Kaachii* and finally *Kaajii*, within a single page. *Kaajii* is the name given in the later Persian histories of Kashmir. It comes through the three dots below being reduced or omitted, leading to *Kaachii* being read *Kaajii*. The original Chakareesha, suffering a contraction characteristic of these Persian writers, has become Chak. The original Chandra (the surname of the Laar nobles) is written as Chand or Hand all over the *Intikhaab* manuscript as pointed out earlier. It led to Rinchana's son being given the wrong name Haidar, though ITK manuscript emphatically refutes it by writing Chand all through. Why the modern historians have preferred the incorrect versions of these names to the original ones which they know, is even more intriguing!
 4. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 176.

the needed quantity of water.” Later it was learnt from reliable witnesses that the woman had been wedded to the clerk. Malik ordered that the woman be handed over to the first husband and charged the second husband for perjury and, fining him heavily, put him in the prison and confiscated his property.

Some time after Muhammad Shah had established his rule on this turn, Fatah Shah’s attendants brought his corpse from Hindustaan to Kashmir.¹ Sultaan Muhammad Shah went to receive the corpse of his uncle, paid due respects, and ordered it to be buried in Sultaan Zainulaabdiin’s cemetery. He killed most of the ministers of Fatah Shah like Saif Ddaangar and others. *Shankar Raina* [Raajana Shringaara]² died a natural death. This occurred in 923 HE.³ Sultaan Sikandar Loodhi, the king of Dahlii, too passed away in the same year.⁴ Ibraahiim Loodhi, his son, succeeded.

Meanwhile Kanchana Chakreesha imprisoned Ibraahiim Maargeesha, along with others. Malik Abdaal, son of Ibraahiim Maargeesha, joining the force from Hindustaan declared Sikandar Khaan, son of Sultaan Fatah Shah, as the head of the kingdom and brought him to Kashmir. Sultaan Muhammad Shah and Kanchana Chakreesha⁵ went to the plain at village *Loolpuur* [Lavlapuuruddara]⁶ to fight⁷ the enemies. Sikandar Khaan not able to fight the Sultaan took refuge in the Naagaam fort. Kanchana

-
1. The original account of Shuka Pandit gives the year of death 95 i.e. 4095 LE (=1519 CE) which is three years later. It also says that Muhammad Shah first heard the news, grieved and the corpse was brought ‘within a few days’ (RTSH, I: 162-68).
 2. RTS, I: 171.
 3. 923 HE approximates 1517 CE, which is not the correct year of Fatah Shah’s death (see *Supra*).
 4. Sikandar Loodhi’s death is given as 1518 CE, which could have approximated the early months of 4095 LE = 1519 CE.
 5. Now the name is written as *Kaajii* with just a single dot below (image 177, lines 12 and 15).
 6. Shuka Pandit (RTSH, I: 179). The battle took place in the year 97 (4097 LE = 1521 CE) i.e. two years after the death of Fatah Shah (*ibid.*).
 7. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 177.

Chakra besieged the fort. The contenders fought one another for quite some time.

The group of Sultaan's *umraa* who had gone to aid Sikandar, desisted. They did not go to him and gathered at *Laar* [Loohara].¹ Malik Kanchana sent his son, named Masuud, to fight them. He fought valiantly and was killed. Finally Malik Masuud's army prevailed. Sikandar Khaan fled Naagaam fort and went away. Malik Kanchana came up the fort. Dislodged, *Maagrees* went looking for Sikandar Khaan. Pleased and Muhammad Shah returned to Kashmir after the triumph.

Around that time, Baabar Paadshah invaded from Kaabul, killed Sultaan Ibraahiim Loodhii in the battle field of Paaniipat and attained victory and glory. This event took place in the year 931 HE.²

About this time some of the intimates poisoned the ears of Sultaan Muhaamad Shah and turned him against Malik Kanchana. Thus troubled, he went to Raajoorii. There he dislodged the Raajas of the surrounding areas in Hindustaan and brought most to submission.

Coincident with this, Sikandar Khaan, who had fled from Sultaan, was joined by some Mongool servants of Merza Haidar Kaamraan and came to Loohar Koott and captured it.³ Kanchana Chakreesha's brother, Taaja Chakra went there, captured Sikandar Khaan in battle and sent him to Sultaan. The Sultaan was much pleased with Malik Kanchana and again conferred ministership upon him. He ordered that a hot needle be passed through Sikandar Khaan's eyes.⁴

1. RTSH, I: 184.

2. The fight of Lavlapuuruddara took place in the year 1521 CE (RTSH, I: 179). The battle of Panipat in which Baabar triumphed took place four year later, in 1525 CE which approximates to 931 HE, as given.

3. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 178.

4. The Blinding of rival princes, a fairly common practice among the Muslim kings, was usually done by having a hot iron needle passed through the eyes. The Persian translator uses that expression - *farmuud*

Sultaan Muhammad Shah's son, named Ibraahim, had accompanied his father to Hindustaan, some years back to meet Ibraahiim Loodhii. Having provided an enormous army to Sultaan Muhammad, he detained Ibraahiim Khaan as gurantee. On Ibraahiim Loodhii's death he returned to Kashmir from Hindustaan, around this time. Since Malik Kanchana Chakra had been much pained by Sultaan blinding Sikandar Khaan, he first imprisoned Sultaan's intimates. He then ordered the imprisonment of Sultaan and put Ibraahiim Khaan, son of Muhammad Shah on the throne. On this term Muhammad Shah had ruled for eleven years, eleven months and eleven days, which was a coincidence.¹

taa dar diidai Sikandar Khaan miil kashiidand. However, the original account states: that the prince's eyes were gouged out. 'The cruel men extracted the eyes of the prince, by the order of the kings, even as the hawks do of the deer' (RTSH, I: 242).

1. This is a coincidence of the Persian translator's make. The original account says: 'Eleven years, ten months and ten days'. (RTSH, I: 257).

RAAJATARANGINII

Of Shuka Pandita

Book II

Sultaan Ibraahiim Shah, son of Sultaan Muhammad Shah, sat on the throne and Malik Kanchan continued to conduct the affairs of state as before. Meanwhile, Abdaal Maagree son of Ibraahiim Maagree, the son of Jahaangiir Maagree, who had suffered much at the hands of Malik Kanchana went to Hindustaan to seek aid and reached unto the service of *hazrat firdoos makaanii* (Baabar). Observing his fine features, etiquette, learning and wisdom, he said in wonder¹, "In jungles too, such persons get bred!"²

Abdaal Maagree submitted, "I have taken refuge in this heavenly abode because of the oppression of enemies. If you assign an army to me, I shall conquer Kashmir for your servants." Favouring him Baabar bestowed fine horses and splendid gifts on him and assigned a huge army for his aid with Mugool captains Shaikh Alii Beeg, Muhammad Khaan and Mahmuud Khaan.³ Seeing that Kashmiris hate Mugals, Abdaal Khaan in compromise, declared Naazuk Shah, the son of Sultaan Fatah Shah the ruler of Kashmir, to exploit his name.

-
1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 179.
 2. Persian translator has added this on his own. The original account says: The king of Turushakas observed the external and mental emotions of the Maargapati, heard what he had to say of his work, and for a short time held down his head in wonder (RTSH, II: 6).
 3. This name is not in the original (RTSH, II: 10).

Malik Kanchana, taking Ibraahiim Shah, put up camp at Neelaag in Pargana Baangil, opposite one another. Malik Kanchana sent a large force to capture Taaraaha [Prataapapur]¹. Abdaal Maagree, after consultations, sent Malik Kanchana a message: "I have joined the service of the sovereign of the age, Baabar Paadashah. The sovereign of the age is a king of such glory and power that he decimated Ibraahiim Loodhii, the king of Dahlii, who had a cavalry of five hundred thousand, in a trice. I have come with his aid. If you wish your safety, enter his service. If you are bereft on this fortune, come forth and fight this force to show the manliness and valour you claim".^{2, 3}

Meanwhile, Malik Kanchana appointed Sayyid Ibraahiim Khaan, Saarang Chakra and Taajaka Chakra three commanders of the three wings of army and came out to fight. The contenders fought so hard as stun the mind. Mugals put the opponents to arrows. Taajaka Chakra, Saaranga Chakra and other Chakra commanders and *umraa* of Ibraahiim Shah got killed. When Malik Kanchana saw that none around him remained alive and he was about to be captured, he fled to the city. Unable to tarry even there he went out to Kohistaan.⁴ Nothing was known of Ibraahiim Shah, and where he went. Ibraahiim Shah's reign lasted eight months and twenty-five days.

Sultaan Naazuk Shah, son of Fatah Shah came to the city after the victory and ascended the throne. He comforted Kashmiris affrighted of Mugals and said, "Don't fear this army for I have captured this kingdom with their aid." Kashmiris were happy at his ascendancy. Sultaan left Shriinagar and made Navshahar, the earlier capital, his abode. Abdaal Maagree, appointed minister,

1. Prataapapura, the present day Taapar (RTSH, II: 11).
2. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 180.
3. The original account says: Chakreesha replied: Dilli is not your country, nor are we the inhabitants of Kashmir. You will derive no benefit from the country of powerful Mugals (RTSH, II: 17).
4. The original account says: When his career had ended Meyya Malika, Saranga Miir and other brothers of Chakri joined the Mugals (RTSH, II: 28).

took Sultaan to Jaimal Nagrii, in pursuit of Malik Kanchana. When they heard that Malik Kanchana had gone to Kohistaan and it was a difficult terrain, they cancelled that campaign and began the division of kingdom.¹

Taking the whole realm he divided *khaalisai* Sultaan (king's land) into four parts.² Taking one part for himself, he apportioned one part to Alii Miir, another to Loohar Maagree and the other to Ragii Chakra. He did not think it prudent to have Baabar's men in Kashmir and sent them to Hindustaan with prodigious gifts and money.³

Sending Malik Kanchana a bristling message, he summoned Sultaan Muhammad Shah. Miir Alii went with the approval of Malik Abdaal and brought Muhammad Shah out of Loohar Koott to Kashmir. They did not find Malik Kanchana, to bring him along. One year after Naazuk Shah's rule, he was deposed.

Sultaan Muhammad Shah then took the rule for the 4th time, with the aid of ministers and lords. He appointed Naazuk Shah heir apparent. This occurred around the time Baabar left the mortal world for the eternal one and Humaayun Paadshah sat on the throne, in 938 HE. One of the learned of this place has composed this quatrain on this:

(Chronograam: *khairulmuluuk* – propriety of the world)

One year after this event, when Merzaa Kaamraan had full sway and control over the realm of Punjab, Malik Kanchana, with a huge force⁴, charged from the realm of Kohistaan and camped in the vicinity of Bijbihaarah. Malik Abdaal went to battle with him and won. Malik Kanchana fled and went to Hindustaan. Shaikh

-
1. The original says they went there only to divide the kingdom, (RTSH, 2: 33).
 2. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 181.
 3. This is incorrect; the Mugals left, one year later, after Muhammad Shah had been re-installed king (RTSH, 2: 40).
 4. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 182.

Alii Beeg, Muhammad Khaan and Mahmuud Mangool, who on Baabar's orders had accompanied Abdaal Maagree and conquered Kashmir, went to Merzaa Kaamraan and submitted: "we know the routes to Kashmir and all about that realm. We have thrown Chakras, the most daring of those people, out of that realm. If you wish, conquest of that realm is possible with minimal effort".

Merzaa Kaamraan, putting Muharam Beeg at the head of a huge army sent him to Kashmir along with those *umraa*. Kashmiris fled to the mountain in fear and, leaving all their possessions and effect in their houses, fended only for life. Merzaa's army looted and set fire to the city. Some with pretensions of valour came down the mountains to fight and were killed.

Before the entry of Mugals, Abdaal Maagree thought that Malik Kanchan Chakra was with them. When, with oaths and promises, he was sure that Malik Kanchan did not come with them, he called Malik Kanchan with his sons and brothers and formulated a union with him. This gave Kashmiris the courage to fight. When they found that Mugals, taking to general massacre¹, had spared none of those who fell into their hands, alive they got together and furiously fought the Mugals. Mugals thinking the time opportune, vacated the realm and returned to their country. After this event, Abdaal Maagree grew proud and the amity formed with Kanchan Malik was deranged. In 939 HE (1532 CE) Kanchan Malik exited Kashmir and set out for Hindustaan.

In that year, Sikandar Khaan son of Sayyid Khaan, Paadshah of Kaashgar, and Merzaa Haidar Kaashgarii came to Kashmir, on the orders of Sayyid Khaan, with twelve thousand men through the Tibet and Laar route. The rigour and prowrs of this force so impacted the Kashmiris that they thought of nothing save escape and vacated the county. They had not been so affrighted of the army of Merzaa Kaamraan as of this army. Commanders, soldiers and subjects of the realm took refuge in mountains and secure nooks. Kaashgariis burnt down the palaces and edifices,

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 183.

which the old and new Sultaans had built at a huge expense. Not a thing could be seen in the houses, in the city and villages. Lofty residences in Qutobudiinpuur and Sikandarpuur, and thousands other like them, on which the revenues of the realm had been expended, were all leveled.¹

So many treasures buried in earth were excavated that the accountants too were unable to count them. Nowhere did any store or reserve remain hidden from Kaashgariis. Their soldiers were suffused with the monies.

Wherever they heard that Kashmiris were hiding, they attacked them and killed and captured them. Affrighted at this, the people of the realm hid in tiny holes. There too Kaashgarii persecuted and ejected them. This fighting and scare continued for three months between the two. Nothing like this had been seen in any age in Kashmir, before.

Kanchan Malik, Abdaal Maagree and other commanders and soldiers, first took refuge on Chakradhar. When they could not hold out there, they fled to Khaavarpaara. From there they came down from the mountains through Maartand and set out to fight. Prince Sikandar Khaan and Merzaa Haidar charged upon them with a huge army. Famous Kashmiri warriors like Malik Alii, Miir Hasan, Shaikh Miir Alii, Miir Kamaal, and others like them got killed. Kaashgariis killed countless other men, too. Kashmiriis were affrighted at the killing of *umraa*, especially Miir Alii, who was known for his valour. Greatly dismayed, they lost heart and contemplated fleeing. At that time, Kanchan Malik and Abdaal Maagree motivated them² to fight and said, "If you take courage, each one of you is a Miir Alii". Kashmiris grew bold, endeavoured so hard on the battle field that nothing better would ever be seen. So many people from the contending parties were killed that it was impossible to keep count. It is said so enormous was the killing that corpses were laid one upon the other on the ground

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 184

2. End of the digitalized manuscript, [image](#) 185.

and some headless bodies as per the sayings of Hindus, described above, were seen dancing.

The battle that day ranged from dawn to dusk. None of the parties was overcome and both parties there were recognized for courage and valour. When night fell, commanders of both armies held conferences saying that no side faltered on the battle field and the end/final result were ambiguous and that there should be peace. Thereupon, the Kaashgariis sent different objects like *suuf*, *saqarlaat* and others with money and other gifts to Sultaan Muhammad Shah to sue for peace. From that side Muhammad Shah sent a peace treaty, written with consonance of Malik Kanchana and Aabdaal Maagree, with his own seal fixed thereupon to Kaashgariis through the negotiator Miir Hasan, with wondrous objects and gifts of Kashmir and it was settled that the daughter of Sultaan Muhammad Shah shall be given in marriage to Prince¹ Sikandar and the families of Kashmiris captured by Mugals shall be set free. The prince acquiesced to this agreement and distributing many gifts to all, left for Kaashgar. Thus the turmoil in Kashmir was turned into peace.

In that year two comets, called Zuvaat and Zunaab, appeared in the sky. Due to their influence there came about a general famine and rise in costs of goods all over the country. A *khaarya* of paddy was not available even for three and a half Akbar Shaahii² rupees. Countless people were lost all over. Such dearth came to visit the public that people turned strangers to one another; everyone was so taken up with worries that none cared for others. The well-to-do were so starved that even if they ate four or five times a day, they were not satiated. The mendicants and destitute starving all over the realm used to cry 'bread' and give up the ghost. Those

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 186.

2. The original account says that a *khaarya* was bought for ten thousand pieces *nshikas* (RTSP, *sh.*, 92). It may be added that *khaarya* as a measure is an ancient one. The word has been incorrectly written as a *kharvaar* and presented to mean 'a kharbaar (mule-load)'. Some naïve even hold that the word originated from the Persian for mule-load. This is roundly incorrect, being an instance of what Stein has called 'reverse etymology'.

who had money died asking for food but did not obtain it. Then it snowed so heavily that the grain crop was all lost. Fiery objects fell from the sky and life became hard for the rich and poor. Most of the destitute chose migration from the land.

Malik Kanchana, Malik Abdaal Maagree and other famous¹ lords got a hundred mounds of cereals cooked each day and fed the mendicants and the needy.² During the famine, gold and silver were cheaper compared to cereals. The people, who had escaped being killed and captured during the invasion of Mugals preceeding it, died of starvation. In that year people forgot the previous destruction and death at the hands of Dulachu. People kenned the conflicts described above a period of peace and luxury, in comparison to the tyranny of the famine. The travails of famine and epidemic in Kashmir lasted ten months. Then it began to ease. When the sun reached *jooza* and jawar, wheat, legumes and other gains and fruits too, ripened, it helped to quell the famine. Those who survived the extremity, were thankful for life, beat drums of joy and feasted one another.³

After this event, the mischievous broke the amity between Kanchana Chakra and Abdaal Maagree. Kanchana Chakra exited from city and campet at Zainapuur. Abdaal Maagree continued to hold the ministership of Sultaan Muhammad Shah.

During the ministership of Abdaal Maagree, officers and collectors cruelly extracted monies from the subjects. Sultaan did not redress the oppression⁴ and corruption became the rule in the county and justice died in the hard winds of persecution. Wicked dalliances appeared in the kingdom. Obscene ways crept into the

1. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 187.

2. The original account talks of only Malik Abdaal and does not give any quantity saying that hundreds were fed rice (RSTP, *sh.*, 95).

3. The original account says: the famine became more severe at the end of Jyeeshta in the year 10 (4610= 1535 CE) than what it had been in the year 9 and spread all over (RTSP, II: 99).

4. End of the digitalized manuscript, image 188.

behavior. Sometime later Sultaan was caught in fevers.¹ He gave away whatever money was there in the treasury and died. His reign from beginning till end lasted fifty years.

Sultaan Shamsudiin son of Muhammad Shah, named Shamas Khaan, succeeded his father. People were happy at his ascendancy. He distributed the estates of the realm among the lords (*umraa*).

A serious strife developed between Kanchana Chakra and Abdaal Maagree. Malik Kanchan took Sultaan to the plain of Koosuu. Abdaal too came out with full force to the battle field. Finally there was peace.² Abdaal went to Kamraaj which was his *jaagiir* and Malik Kanchana returned to the city. After a few days Abdaal, on the instigation of some mischief mongers, broke the covenant and created trouble in Kamraaj. Later that trouble was quelled and peace restored.³

It should not remain unknown that on the orders of Akbar Shah, affairs of Sultaan Shamas Khaan and other Sultaans have been written by some contemporary scholars till 999, when the savants of the lofty kingdom (Mugals) conquered Kashmir and included it among the counties of Hindustaan. That (account) has been recorded year by year. A selection of that was not ordered. Hence this account ends here.

1. As per Shuka Pandit (RTSP, II: 108) Muhammad Shah fell ill, in the later part of *Chaitra*, in the year 13 (i.e. 4613 Le =1538 CE).
2. This is not exactly what the original account of Shuka Pandit (RTSP, II: 128-34) says: Kacha Chakra came to the city from Zainapuur (*sh.*, 128); Hosana thereupon joined Utsabhata and went to Maargapati (Abdaala) at Kichaashrama (*sh.*, 129); Kacha Chakra was honoured by the king (*sh.*, 130); to subdue the enemies, Kanchana Chakresha encamped at Gardasooddara (*sh.*, 131); Maargapatiis (Abdaala & others) placed their troops in the neighborhood of Jalagada (*sh.*, 132); noble minded Riga Chakreesha went to Kacha Chakra and Maargapati and tried to establish peace (*sh.*, 133); he said 'Let Kacha remain in city and Maargapatiis in Kramraajya (*sh.*, 134)'.
3. Here ends the narration of Shuka Pandit (Srikanth Kaul, Text page 355), edited by Srikanth Kaul, 1966, titled *Raaja Taranginii of Shriivara and Shuka*, Published by Visheeshvar Anand Institute, Hoshiarpur.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aini Akbari, Abu Fazl Vol. I, English tr., H. Blochman, 1871, Atlanta Publishers and Distibuters, New Delhi

Aini Akbarii, Abul Fazl, Vol II, English tr. H. S. Jarret, Atlanta Publishers and Distributers, New Delhi

A Q Rafiqi, 2008, *History of Kashmir*, Gulshan Books, Srinagar

Bahaaristaan Shaahii, English tr., K N Pandita, 1991, Firma KLM Pvt. Ltd, Calcutta

G M D Suufii, 1946, *Kashiir*; reprint 2008, Volume I& II, Ali Mohd and Sons, Srinagar

Kalhana's *Raajataranginii*, English tr. M A Stein, 1900, reprint 1989, Vol I, Vol II, Vol III, Moti Lal Banarasi Das, New Delhi

Kings of Kashmir, English tr. Jogesh Chandar Dutt, Volume III, 1898, single volume reprint 1996

Medieval Kashmir by Jogesh Chandar Dutt, edited by S L Sadhu, 1993, Atlantic Publishers, New Delhi

Muntakhabul Tavaariikh, Obdul Kaadir Badaayuunii, Urdu tr. A A Khaan, 2012 print, NCPUL, New Delhi, Vol I, Vol II

Mukamal Taariikhi Kashmiir, Muhammad Diin Fook, edition 2011, Farid Book Depot Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi

Raghu Nath Singh, 1972, *Raajataranginii* of Joonaraaja, Hindi translation, Chowkhamba Publishers, Varanasi

Shasmusdiin Ahmad, 2008, *Raajataranginii Joonaraaja*, Urdu tr., Vol. I & II, Gulshan Publishers, Srinagar

Srikanth Kaul, 1966, *Raajataranginii of Shriivara & Shuka*, Visheshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur, Punjab

Srikanth Kaul, 1967, *Raajataranginii of Joonaraaja*, Visheshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur, Punjab

Taariikhi Farishta, Muhammad Kaasim Farishta, Urdu tr., Obdul Ganii Khvaaja, 1983, Vol I, Vol II, Maktaba Millat, Deevaband, UP

Taariikhi Haidar Malik Chaadduurah, Persian text given in the English tr. titled 'History of Kashmir' by Razia Bano, 1991, Bhavana Prakashan, New Delhi

Taariikhi Hasan, Persian text, 1956, Vol. I and Vol. II, Research Department, J&K Govt

Taariikhi Kashmiir by Sayyid Alii bini Sayyid Muhammad, (*Taariikhi Sayyid Alii*) Persian text, 1993, Research Department, JK Govt

Taariikhi Kashmir Azmii (Vaakaati Kashmiir), Muhammad Azm Dyadama'ry, Persian text, Lahore, 1885, Fakiir Allah Kutub Faroosh, Lahore

Taariikhi Rashiidii, Merzaa Haidar Duglaat, English tr., E D Ross, 1895, Vol. I & II, reprint 2007, ABI Prints & Publishing Co., New Delhi

Tohfatul Ahbaab, English tr. Kashinath Pandit, A Muslim Missionary in Mediaeval Kashmir, 2009, voice of India, New Delhi

Vaakaati Kashmiir, Muhammad Azm Dyadama'ry, Persian text, 1937, Gulaam Muhammad Nuur Muhammad Taajiraani Kutub, Maisuma, Srinagar



Editorial consultant, editor and lead writer of several English language papers and periodicals. Dr Bhat is a free-lance writer and columnist. Dr Bhat has published hundreds of articles, papers, and reviews in leading English newspapers and journals of the state and country. Writer, activist, he is also the President of Kashmiri Sahitya Akademi, and President of Kashmiri Sahitya Akademi Pratishthan (SAM) a Jammu-based organisation of Kashmiri writers.

His published works include two collections of poems, columns Randomly Around India and Around Kashmir, an account of the ancient Amarnathji shrine Faith Besieged, a study of the 12th century Sanskrit introduction of Shaivism Paraa Praveeshikaa, written by Raaja, Abhinava Gupta Paad's chief disciple.

Dr Bhat's recent works include Rationalisation of Kashmiri, a widely appreciated introduction to standardize the use of English Alphabet in Kashmiri, Hindi/Urdu etc., Azad, The Poet, English translation of the major poems of Mirza Asad Khan, Lal And Her Vaakh, an English collection of all the Vaakhs attributed to Lal, Hindu Shrines of Kashmir, documenting the temples and shrines spread over the entire breadth of the Kashmir valley, is a comprehensive historical and temporal reference work on

او بغایت عادل بود و خلق در لایم کمال رفاهیت و خوشحالی داشتند و از بهت
 عدالت و خوبه او چندین کسی از فرزندان او سلطنت رسید و او سی و چهار سال
 حکومت راند و درگذشت **راجہ بہکین** نام پسرش بعد از ان جانشین پسر
 و سی و پنج سال حکومت کرد و درگذشت **راجہ اندر جت** پسرش بعد از پدر
 حکومت یافت و سی و شش سال حکومت راند و درگذشت **راجہ راؤن** نام
 پسرش بعد از ان بجای پد حکم شد و او بسیاری را از ملک ہندستان قلعہ نمود و
 سی سال حکومت کرد و رفت **راجہ بہکین** پسرش بعد از ان حکومت یافت
 او چون علم موسیقی را خوب و رزیدہ بود و اکثر اوقاتش صرف گفتن سرود شنید
 او از وساز میشد و اکثر نیز می گفتند و مدت حکومت او سی و پنج سال بود
راجہ نر پسرش بعد از ان جانشین پدر شد او بسیار بیدار کرد و چون کوشید
 کہ یکی از جلد بدان طلسم میدانت چنانکہ اگر میخواست او مہ را میدید و کسی
 نمیتوانست دیدن و باین طلسم بجانہ مردم درجی آمد و با زانی مکانہ فادی میکرد
 چون راجہ نیز این سخن بشنید بسیار اعراضی شد و حکم کرد تا مہ معابد و دیوار
 فرواب کردند و راجہ در چکر نام قصبہ کہ حالاداخل خراجت ساکن می بود
 و مورخان کشمیر عہدہ برایشانت میگویند کہ در زمان راجہ نر بہمنی



gulshanbooks.com

Cover design: mavilaindia@gmail.com

ISBN 978-81-8339-425-3



₹1195

9 788183 394253

US\$21.99